NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCLXXVIII.

SEPTEMBER, 1896.

FROM A SILVER TO A GOLD STANDARD IN BRITISH HONDURAS.

BY HIS EXCELLENCY, SIR ALFRED MOLONEY, K. C. M. G., GOVERNOR OF BRITISH HONDURAS.

APPRECIATING that the financial transactions connected with a change of standard which is unique in the history of currency, and the consequences of such a new departure, must be of general interest and concern, I have ventured, with some hesitation, in response to an invitation with which I have been honored by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, to illustrate my experience of the substitution of gold for silver in the Colony of British Honduras.

During the latter half of 1892 a feeling of popular concern manifested itself in the Colony in connection with the general condition of the silver market of the world and its local effect on exchange and trade, and in regard to the purchasing power of the dollar in that metal which had depreciated to such an extent that many were hit hard, particularly those dependent upon fixed incomes and wages. This concern assumed activity in the form of an earnest and enthusiastic movement in favor of a gold standard. The chief causes for the change advocated may be briefly summarized as the decline of the public credit, the instability of the value of the standard dollar as measured in terms of gold, with its alarming and embarrassing depreciation, the abnor-

Copyright, 1896, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All rights reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mal and fitful rate of exchange and the consequent derangement and uncertainty of trade. Thus prevailed a constant worry and a bewildering uncertainty which resulted practically in the conversion of legitimate trade into speculative gambling; as can be appreciated when it is known that the value of the Guatemalan silver dollar, the local standard, varied no less than fifty per cent. within eighteen months.

In 1891, the purchasing power of the "sol" equalled 72 cents, gold; at the time of the establishment in October, 1894, of the new standard, it was represented by 50 cents, net, above which it has not been quoted since.

With no direct cable connection and with an exchange rate continually varying, calculations as to prices were conjectural; goods had to be figured capriciously in anticipation of a fall, whether one occurred or not, or at a rate ruling at the time of importation; and when sold, as was frequently the case, at a credit of six months or more, serious loss was often experienced. Consequently, traders were dazed, imports decreased, selling prices had to be constantly readjusted and greatly advanced and the main burden fell upon the consumers whose income, whether fixed or as wages, had not correspondingly increased. These became discontented and irritated with the exporters, who were the few persons who really made money during the period, as they worked with the depreciating, and realized in the appreciating, money. Enterprise was discouraged. Sales of property were suspended. As material had chiefly to be imported, builders fought shy of contracts, as they never could tell how they would come out. The shrinkage of the value of the "sol" meant corresponding loss to most and had a most demoralizing effect, tending to destroy prudence and thrift. Progress under such circumstances was impossible.

Change of currency being among those questions which are reserved for the consideration and approval of Her Majesty the Queen before legislation effecting it could take take form, the Home Government were memorialized and the prayer of the people to have a gold standard, and that the dollar of the United States of America, was heard; and the principle of a state issue of notes against gold was accepted. It was also allowed to the Colony to have its own token silver coinage. The enactment of the necessary legislation in the form of "The Coinage Ordi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nance" and "The Currency Note Ordinance" followed. The former demonetized the then existing currency; provided for its redemption within a specified time at a prescribed rate, which was 50 cents to the dollar, determined by a committee of experts appointed for the purpose and representing the ratio of the new to the old currency which ruled at the date of the change; erected the gold dollar of the United States of America into the standard coin of British Honduras, and made the gold coins of the United States Mint legal tender for the amounts of their respective denominations in standard dollars, as well as the British sovereign and half sovereign for the amounts of $4.867 and $2.433 respectively; established for internal circulation in the Colony a subsidiary coinage at par with gold which comprised fifty cents, twenty-five cents, ten cents and five cents silver pieces and the bronze cent piece current at the time; fixed $10 as the limit of legal tender in silver and 50 cents for mixed metal or nickel coins; and continued "accounting" in dollars and cents.

The latter law provided for the establishment of Commissioners of Currency, and authorized, as an additional subsidiary currency, the issue against gold by them of a colonial paper currency, in notes of one, two, five, ten and one hundred dollars, and any multiple of one hundred, as legal tender to any amount, and fully secured.

The amount of gold, notes, and silver in the new coins requisite to effect the change having been imported, the period fixed for the redemption of the demonetized dollar was October 15th, 1894 (when the ordinances referred to came into operation), and six days thereafter, exclusive of Sunday; but, in deference to the public interests and convenience, the time was extended to the 27th of October.

During the specified period the old money tendered in amounts of fifty dollars and under was exchanged at the prescribed rate for the new currency. For larger amounts deposit receipts were given and cashed within one month after date of issue.

The demonetized "sols" received in the Treasury were shipped out of the Colony and sold for what they were worth, the amount realized being used to pay for the purchase of the money that was substituted for them. Only about one-third of the number of the dollars demonetized has had so far to be replaced by the Colonial token money, the difference having been made

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

up by notes which, circulating on the credit of the government and being convertible on demand into gold, serve now, as far as they go, all purposes of money and have the same currency as gold and silver.

As to the losses sustained by the holders of the displaced silver by reason of its depreciation, there was an unanimous opinion that they should be regarded as having already accrued; and there was no attempt made at the time to suggest that they should be tampered with by legislation. What was sauce for the goose was accepted as good for the gander. A desire manifested itself to have existing contracts completed by payment in the old currency. It was, however, made clear that a secondary currency, which the acceptance of such a view would have involved, would in most cases be productive of much inconvenience, notably in the case of open accounts in which moneys would be due upon the date of demonetization. An automatic conversion of such existing and running debts from the old into the new currency was acknowledged by many to be free from hardship, and to have the merit of simplicity and finality.

As regards the treatment of outstanding liabilities at the time of the change, it was desired by some that the settlement of debts and contracts expressed in the then silver should be fixed for the day of maturity, and allowed in the "sol," or in its gold equivalent at that date, and at the ratio of conversion to be arrived at by the local treasury. Such a proposal was viewed as an endeavor to deal selfishly and piecemeal with the question, some of its advocates being doubtless solely influenced by the hope that the value of the then existing currency would go up to their individual benefit at the time of the settlement.

The only advantage that could be hoped for from this course would be that the parties concerned might possibly be restored, by further violent fluctuations in the old currency in the direction opposite to what experience showed to be likely, to a position approaching that which obtained at the date of the contract. Such an advantage would have involved in any event a loss to one party; it would not have applied to ordinary debts due at the time; it would have been limited to comparatively few transactions; and finally it would have been greatly counterbalanced by the complications and difficulties which would inevitably have arisen from the legislation of the circulation of two opposition

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

currencies of different values, the one comparatively fixed, the other ever fitful. After careful consideration it was, however, decided that they should be converted into obligations in terms of the new currency according to a rate of exchange approximating as near as possible that actually ruling at the date of the change of the system. It was appreciated at the time that, whilst the principle involved was open to some objection, it could hardly be said to involve more probability of unfairness to one of the parties than to the other, and that on the grounds of equity and convenience it was the best.

Moneys that were payable after the commencement of the Coinage Act under and by virtue of any contract, judgment, order, transaction or dealing made or entered into before its operation, or under and by virtue of any testamentary instrument, and that would have been payable in the old money, had there been no change, were legally made payable at the prescribed rate of exchange in the new coins. In addition, the requisite steps were followed and measures adopted, as soon as sufficient experience of the effect of the change justified action, to adjust, as far as was deemed necessary, to the new order of things the customs, excise, and license duties and other taxes, fines, fees of court, and any other dues or payments, affecting the local government, which were not sufficiently dealt with otherwise.

The gold standard has now been established nearly two years, and on no occasion has it been found that there is more silver subsidiary coin than is required. On the contrary, it has been, since, in constant demand and never at a discount; which may be accepted as proof that there is no redundancy of circulation.

So as to secure effectively and at all times the free convertibility of the silver token coinage into gold, as the best proof of the thorough soundness of the change, it was necessary to keep the issue of the former within strict limits, illustrating the bare requirements of the people as regards their small change.

Some anxiety, which subsequent experience has proved to have been groundless, was entertained at the time of the change of the currency, that there might accumulate in certain hands the new silver to an appreciable amount, and that the holders would be disadvantageously placed as regards making their remittances abroad if it were not convertible at the treasury, to an unlimited amount, for gold. Should later experience and an ex-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pansion of the Colony's domestic requirements clearly demonstrate an insufficiency of its token money, there will be no danger in increasing it, if provision be made for its convertibility into gold, should occasion require it, which will prove to be the most effectual check against any over-issue.

The greatest care and vigilance have been and must necessarily continue to be exercised to maintain the current value in exchange of the token money and the proportion brought into circulation had naturally to be limited in relation to that of the superior currency, the note issue, and gold, of which it represented proportionate parts.

Under the circumstances it was thought, at the time of enacting the ordinance respecting the coinage, to be unnecessary to provide therein for the conversion into gold of the subsidiary silver money requisite to effect the change.

Fears were entertained when the question of currency reform from time to time attracted public attention that a sudden change in the standard might seriously disorganize the industries of the Colony and such disorganization would be much greater, it was thought, were an attempt made to set up an artificial and entirely new standard. No such anticipations have so far been realized; they were chiefly entertained by those who desired the continuance of the old currency from interested motives for their own individual benefit. A few with no interested motives conservatively wished to adhere to the old state of things. Not a single closure of any commercial house, the failure of whose business can be associated with the change, has occurred. The staple industry, logwood, has increased. Increment is also anticipated for mahogany and fruit this year; in 1894-5 operations of cutting had to be contracted on account of fall in price of the former.

Not only has trade considerably expanded, but there has been an appreciable increase, over forty per cent., in the number of importers since 1894. Formerly, the smaller importers did their business through the larger houses; it is so no longer. Any healthy widening of the basis of commerce by the creation of additional independent traders of varied interests must be to the ultimate advantage of any country. Competition has become keener to secure trade, which has had the tendency to reduce prices. From the agricultural backwardness of the country, due

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to various causes, local produce for home consumption has not gone down to the prices that should obtain; but competition should in time effect reduction.

The laboring classes, the backbone of the Colony, have largely benefited as regards wages, the dollars now earned equalling the number formerly received by them in "sols." Savings Bank deposits have increased. Land and house property, whether in town or country, has increased one hundred per cent. in value, commanding now in gold the same amount received formerly in the money it replaced.

This increased prosperity has also been reflected in the vital statistics of the Colony, as is illustrated by the marked improvement* in the birth rate and the lowering of the death rate, and this improvement has been steadily maintained since. The marriage rate, which is accepted as a good index in other countries, cannot be relied upon here, for reasons not germane to the article.

During the whole of last year ninety days' drafts on England were at $4.80 to the pound sterling, a few bills being sold during the summer at $4.82, and during the Christmas season some at $4.75 on account of a slight fluctuation in supply and demand; drafts on the United States have generally been at par, though occasionally sold at a discount and some at a premium of one-half or one per cent.; ninety days' drafts on England bought here at $4.80 have frequently sold in the United States at $4.86 per pound sterling, showing a profit of over one per cent., which admitted of the larger commercial houses accommodating the smaller with exchange at par.

The sale of bills is no longer a monopoly nor the capricious thing it was. Accommodation has ceased to be a favor and has become a matter of business.

As regards the local treasury transactions since the change, bills of exchange at ninety days on England have been purchased by the government at $4.75 to $4.82 to the pound, an average of $4.78 for the pound sterling, resulting on realization in a profit.

British Honduras being co-terminous with silver-using coun-

*The birth rate of a population furnishes a good index of prosperity when read with other matters. Indeed, some vital statisticians go so far as to state that "a high birth rate is the invariable concomitant of prosperity." Farr's *Vital Statistics*, p. 8.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tries and having trade connections with others, "sols" find their way, as was to be expected, into the Colony. Although it is clearly understood that there is no legal obligation to accept them and that recipients hold them on their own responsibility, they are taken at their gold value as an accommodation in commercial transactions between buyer and seller, and exported to be realized in gold. There is no fear of their again affecting the silver position of the Colony.

It is not so however with the silver of the United States, which, although not legal tender, has crept into and mingles freely with the legal currency of British Honduras, being taken freely by the merchants, but at their own risk. It was introduced, soon after the change of the standard, by the fruit steamers from the United States to meet their requirements, and it is now as readily received as the token money of the Colony. Consequently, there has been no equivalent displacement or drainage of gold for export as was thought by some to have taken place. Nothing but legal tender coins will continue to be received by the government.

Nevertheless, it must not be overlooked that the silver dollar, with its component parts, of the United States, circulates here at an artificial value, that intrinsically it is worth less than the Mexican dollar which had to be demonetized in British Honduras, and that an English sovereign would purchase about nine of them outside of the United States. In connection with its local circulation, the greatest vigilance must continue to be exercised; true, so long as silver in the United States is maintained on a par with gold, the former could always be exported there without serious loss; but, should it be otherwise, what then?

The dominating question here has been for years the currency problem; it has been coquetted with and never seriously faced for various reasons into which it is unnecessary now to enter. It can be fairly claimed that the facts notified in this article demonstrate that a satisfactory settlement of the much vexed question, Currency, has at last been arrived at. Public credit re-established on a sound basis has been repaired and enhanced. Stability and rate of exchange equalling these obtaining in any country have been secured. There is reason no longer for hesitation to invest capital; before, capitalists naturally shrank from putting money into a country where a barometrical

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

money value and rate of exchange existed. Now gold is paid for in gold and the country's products are worked and realized in gold ; in fact, a money has been established which is of the same value to every one whether payer or payee. Unquestionably the change has been so far a valuable boon to the Colony, and it may be reasonably anticipated that it will prove to be a still greater one in the future.

The subject has been approached and handled with care, prudence and forethought, and all are to be congratulated who contributed to the unquestionable success of so delicate and exceptional a financial revolution. So far as I have been able to gauge its effect, the new currency has been received and accepted with general satisfaction ; even the few who silently and selfishly opposed its establishment now appreciate that the spasmodic gain they acquired formerly from the depreciation of silver is incomparable with the stability of the rating of exchange now assured, the sense of security enjoyed, and the material benefits derived from the gold standard.

ALFRED MOLONEY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ARE THE FARMERS POPULISTS?

BY JOHN M. STAHL, SECRETARY OF THE FARMERS' NATIONAL CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES.

He who thinks that the farmers of this country are not in favor of sound finance and are more favorably disposed towards a depreciated currency than are the rest of our population, does them an injustice, and must have forgotten or misinterpreted a consistent chain of facts in our political history. Of the two principal political parties now in existence, it may be said broadly, but none the less accurately, that the Republican party has stood for safe and sound finance and the jealous upholding of the national credit, while the Democratic party has championed measures for a depreciated currency and the debasement of the national credit. Equally prominent is another fact: the strength of the Democratic party has been in the cities, while the farmers have been the strength and support of the Republican party. New York State is a striking illustration of this. The Democratic majorities have been in the cities; from the farms have come the votes that made majorities for the party that has stood for a sound currency and the strictly honest discharge of every financial obligation, private or public. Why, then, should the farmer, more than other classes, be accused of susceptibility to financial heresies, and of a disposition to debase our currency? His vote shows the very opposite.

The fiat-greenback heresy furnishes such a striking parallel to the present demand for the free coinage of silver that it will be instructive to recall the chief events of its course; and, in fact, this is necessary to any proper consideration of the farmer's attitude towards financial problems, and the campaign of 1872 is such a close parallel to that of 1896 that it may well have our careful study.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The sentiment in favor of a partial repudiation, at least, of the war debt was strong immediately after the close of the Civil War. Naturally enough, the element that had opposed the national government in its war measures, including those to provide the necessary financial means, was now ready to advocate the repudiation, in part or wholly, of the debt contracted to preserve the Union, and this element was strengthened by the currency-contraction policy of Mr. McCulloch, Secretary of the Treasury. At that time President Johnson was the head of all the elements opposed to the Republican party, and in his annual message to Congress in December, 1868, he declared that "the holders of our securities have already received upon their bonds a larger amount than their original investment, measured by the gold standard. Upon this statement of facts it would seem to be but just and equitable that the six per cent. interest now paid by the government should be applied to the reduction of the principal, in semi-annual instalments, which in sixteen years and eight months would liquidate the entire national debt." The opposition to the issue of greenbacks, when such an issue seemed necessary to the continuance of the war for the preservation of the Union, had been led by Mr. Geo. H. Pendleton, of Ohio; and in 1868 Mr. Pendleton was again the leader of the Democratic party in its policy as to greenbacks, but he and that party now entertained such a radically different view of the greenback that they proposed to use it altogether in payment of the public debt. "The same currency for the bond-holder and the plow-holder,"[2] was the cry of the Democrats. It will be seen that they made the mistake of appealing particularly to the farmer for support in their assault on the national credit and honor. The rivalry between Mr. Pendleton and Mr. Chase led to the nomination of Mr. Seymour, but the Pendleton element wrote the platform adopted by the convention that met in New York city, July 4, 1868. The boldest, most positive declaration in that platform was that "all the obligations of the government, not payable by their express terms in coin, ought to be paid in lawful money." The Republicans took direct issue with this position. General Hawley, the permanent chairman of the Republican National Convention, in his speech on taking the chair, used the most emphatic language in declaring that the national honor must be kept unstained. "For every dollar of national debt the blood

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of a soldier is pledged. Every bond, in letter and in spirit, must be as sacred as a soldier's grave!" he exclaimed, and the Convention broke into prolonged applause. The platform was not less forcible, and was more specific in declaring that every obligation of the government must be discharged honestly and in good faith. "The best money for the bond-holder and for the plow-holder," said the Republicans. Governor Seymour made a tour as far west as Illinois, closing only with the national canvass. He made many addresses. He was a most skilful and captivating orator. The chief topics of his speeches were the cost of government and the burden of taxation. How did the farmers respond to his seductive appeals, that on the one hand magnified debts and taxes and on the other hand offered easy means of paying debts and a smaller tax burden? *Every agricultural State gave a majority for the Republican ticket.* And the Democratic vote was strongest in the cities, the Republican vote in the country. New York city gave Seymour 60,000 majority; the rest of the State gave Grant 50,000 majority. In Philadelphia, the Democrats had a small majority at the October election, but the rest of the State gave a Republican majority of 10,000, which was considerably increased in November. The election was uncomfortably close. Only the large farmer vote decided the issue against repudiation and for honest finance and national honor.

In his inaugural address of March 4, 1869, President Grant took strong ground in favor of upholding the national credit. "Let it be understood," he said, "that no repudiator of one farthing of our public debt will be trusted in public place, and it will go far to strengthen our public credit, which ought to be the best in the world." The first act to receive his signature (March 18, 1869) was the act "to strengthen the public credit," which pledged the government to "the payment in coin, or its equivalent, of all obligations, notes, and bonds, except those wherein the law authorizing the issue stipulated that payment might be made in lawful money, which simply meant legal-tender notes." It did not receive a Democratic vote in either the House or the Senate. The arguments of the Democrats now are remarkably like those employed by Mr. Thurman, Mr. Bayard, and Mr. Garrett Davis, in opposition to the act, before the Senate in March, 1869. The refunding acts of July 14, 1870, and of August 20, 1871, provided for the refunding of the public

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

debt in bonds, all of which were made payable in coin. The payment in coin was persistently resisted by the Democrats, but the acts became laws by the votes of Republicans in the House and the Senate and the signature of a Republican President.

Thus the issue continued to be clearly defined and events were taking shape for the campaign of the next year. The conditions then existing were remarkably like those now prevailing. The Republican party, the friend of the greenback to such an extent as the necessities of the war made its use justifiable, refused to put it to a use that would have violated good faith and tarnished the national credit. The Republican party, that has shown its friendship for silver by coining more of it than have all other political parties combined in the history of this government, now refuses to coin it under conditions and to an extent that would violate good faith and tarnish the public credit. Two years before, in 1870, there had originated and in the intervening time there had developed an intense personal hostility to President Grant among certain members of his own party; two years ago such hostility to President Cleveland originated and has since increased. President Grant was accused of grasping powers that did not belong to the Executive; of responsibility for an alleged dangerous centralization of power in the national government; of unwarranted participation in the affairs of State governments; of being arbitrary; of allowing personal likes and dislikes to have too much influence in appointment to office; of using political patronage to influence legislation, and of growing rich more rapidly than is becoming to the Chief Executive. The hostility to President Cleveland within his own party originated in the same charges. In 1872, as in 1896, there were Republican "bolters," who put protection, the cardinal principle of the Republican party, in a secondary place—the "Liberal" Republicans declaring in their National Convention at Cincinnati that the tariff question should be remitted to the people in their Congressional districts; and the Republican bolters in 1896 have acted on the ground that protection is unimportant compared with silver coinage. It will be noted, also, that in 1870-2 as in 1894-6 the President and the element in his own party opposed to him were at odds on tariff legislation. The real originators of the "Liberal" Republican movement were all free traders, and President Grant was as much opposed to their tariff views as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

President Cleveland was to the Wilson bill. The "Liberal" Republican Convention denounced repudiation and demanded the speedy return to specie payments, thus taking grounds on the money question directly opposed to that occupied by the Democratic party up to that time; and at its National Convention that year the Democratic party adopted the platform of the Republican bolters. In 1896 the Republican bolters take grounds on the money question opposed to that previously occupied by the Democracy, and the Democratic National Convention again adopts the financial platform of the Republican bolters. In 1872, there were defections from the Democratic ranks as there are in 1896, claiming that the mass of the party, and not they, had ceased to be Democrats. In 1872 Grant was nominated with great enthusiasm on the first ballot; and, for the first time since, the Republican National Convention this year nominated a candidate for the Presidency on the first ballot, and with great enthusiasm. There was an even more marked likeness in the condition of the public mind. Times were hard and the people were filled with unrest. In his "Twenty Years of Congress," Mr. Blaine says:

"When the Forty-second Congress met in December, 1871, specie was going to Europe at the rate of $66,000,000 per annum, and the balance of trade for that fiscal year was running against the United States to the amount of $183,000,000. It was a period of financial theories. The prejudice against national banks seemed to increase, and the *fiat* of a government so rich and powerful as that of the United States would, it was maintained, suffice to make all the notes it might put out available as money, and the volume ought to be abundant enough to stimulate every nerve of production and trade."

How has all this reappeared in 1896, even to the overestimate of the power of the fiat of this government to make value! Then the export of gold, the adverse balance of trade, and the distrust of the national credit were the direct results, and the hard times, the popular unrest, and the large brood of financial heresies the indirect, but certain, results of an unwise readjustment of the tariff, leading to insufficient national revenue; and the same cause is responsible for the same results to-day. Business men clearly saw then that it would be impossible for the national government to make good its promises to pay, to uphold the national credit, if such conditions continued, and the result was a distrust culminating in panic and deep financial depression.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For some years previous to 1872, there had been a clamor for reduction in duties. It was declared that the receipts of the government were too large. How familiar has all this been made to us since! Congress responded to the popular demand. The act of July 4, 1870, reduced the revenues of the national government $70,000,000 a year. The acts of March 5, May 1 and June 6, 1872, made a further reduction of $65,000,000 per year in the national revenues. The result was inevitable. Like conditions have like effect on the credit of individuals and of nations. If a man or a nation would retain financial honor and be prosperous, one as well as the other must have enough money to meet the just demands of creditors.

As the campaign of 1872 progressed, the Republicans stood more and more for increased revenue and a jealous regard and substantial measures for the national credit. The Republicans had passed the credit-strengthening act and the refunding acts, against the solid opposition of the Democracy, and stood by those acts. The Democracy, adopting the anti-repudiation platform of the "Liberal" Republicans, not because it expressed their convictions, but in an ignoble hope of winning an election and gaining office, drifted more and more to their old position, and before the close of the campaign stood for the fiat greenback heresy. Again the same issue, and the same conditions and divisions confront us this year. How did the farmers vote in 1872? Read, and know how they will vote in 1896. As in 1868, *every agricultural state gave the Republican national ticket a large majority.* Mr. Greeley had been very popular with the farmers. He had been an oracle to many of them. Perhaps no other man in our history has enjoyed such a closely personal popularity among the farmers of this country. But this popularity availed him naught, when a vote for him meant a vote for national discredit. The farmers turned from their old and once trusted friend and voted to pay the national debt in coin and not in fiat-greenbacks.*

*In 1872 the vote was: New York State—Greeley, 387,282; Grant, 440,738. New York County—Greeley, 77,814; Grant, 54,667. Kings County—Greeley, 38,108; Grant, 33,969. Ohio gave 37,531 majority for Grant, but Hamilton County, containing Cincinnati, gave a majority for Greeley, notwithstanding its large German population and Greeley's views on sumptuary legislation. Kansas, very nearly a purely agricultural State, gave more than two votes for Grant to one for Greeley. Michigan, another purely agricultural State, did very nearly as well. Illinois gave nearly four votes for Grant to three for Greeley, and Cook County, it must be said, did even better than the State; but Peoria, Adams, and Sangamon Counties, containing the three largest cities in the State after Chicago, gave majorities for Greeley. Minnesota gave more than three votes for Grant to two for Greeley, but Ramsey County, containing its largest city, gave a majority for Greeley. Iowa gave very nearly two votes for Grant to one for Greeley, but Lee, Dubuque, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Blaine was one of the most accurate political observers and analysts this country has produced. He was well aware that it was not the country, but the city, that made the stronger demand for dishonest finance. To quote again from his monumental work:

"The Forty-third Congress met in a period of discouragement and disaster. . . . The situation gave fresh arguments to the champions of the *fiat* dollar. . . . A large proportion of the business men, especially in the West and Southwest, believed that an increased circulation of notes would bring great relief."

Note that it was not from the farmers, but from the business men, that, according to the Speaker of the Forty-third Congress, came the clamor that led that Congress to raise the limit of United States notes to $400,000,000. President Grant vetoed the act. The act for the resumption of specie payments was passed by the Senate December 21, 1874, and by the House January 7, 1875, the Democrats in both branches of Congress voting solidly against it. It was promptly signed by the President, who accompanied his approval of the act with a special message, in which he recommended *an increase of the revenues*. Congress heeded this recommendation and passed the bill approved March 31, 1875, "to protect the sinking fund and provide for the exigencies of the government." Thus the seat of the disease was reached. The last fierce fight for the "rag baby" was made in Ohio in the fall of the same year, and not even his great personal popularity among the farmers availed "Bill" Allen—the original "Populist"—and he was defeated. The next year the fiat-greenback heresy had so few supporters that when the Greenback national party nominated the justly popular Peter Cooper for President he could poll only 80,000 votes in all the country. This was the fiat-greenback strength until, not the farmer, but the city labor unions favored it, and developed the Labor Greenback party which, in 1878, polled a million votes. Not on the farms, but in the cities, were the fiat-greenbackers!

The fiat-greenback idea of the seventies, reproduced in the nineties as the fiat-silver idea, and both founded on the assump-

Scott Counties, containing three large cities of the State, gave majorities for Greeley, while such purely agricultural counties as Osceola gave 302 votes for Grant to 9 for Greeley, and Lyon gave 87 votes for Grant to 1 for Greeley. Nebraska, a purely agricultural State, gave 70 per cent. of its vote for Grant. Wisconsin gave Grant a handsome majority, although all its counties casting more than 3,000 votes, with one exception, gave majorities for Greeley. The vote of 1868 exhibits exactly the same proof that the farmers made the Republican majorities.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion that this government is strong enough to nullify monetary law, and in opposition to all other nations—this idea, Mr. Blaine pointed out, gained greatest acceptance among business men of the West and Southwest. Because the unsound money sentiment has been strongest in these agricultural sections, it has been generally supposed to belong to farmers more than to other classes. Such a supposition, natural to those content to accept surface indications, would not be entertained by such a man as Mr. Blaine. As the people of the West and Southwest have been and are borrowers rather than lenders, compared with the people of the East, it is but natural that propositions to pay debts easily should find more favor in the West and Southwest than in the East; but, as Mr. Blaine observed, and as their votes eloquently testify, farmers are less disposed than are other classes to support the financial heresies that hard times always incubate. The same superficial, mistaken observers that conclude that farmers are in favor of sound money, because unsound money theories find most favor in the West and Southwest, also hold, and as incorrectly, the farmer responsible for Populism. Yet, in the greatest agricultural states of the Union, Populism has scarcely been tolerated by the farmers, and the Populist party has made a respectable showing only in the towns and cities. Iowa now disputes with Illinois the honor of being the greatest agricultural State in the Union. What figure has the Populist party cut in Iowa? In Illinois the Populist vote has been nearly altogether in the towns and cities, Chicago alone furnishing more than one half the Populist vote of the entire State. In the other great agricultural States, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, etc., Populism has cut no figure.*

*In Illinois the first Populist ticket was voted on in 1894. The Populist vote of the entire State was 29,793; of Cook County, 33,966—more than one-half. Citizens of Chicago, and other cities and towns, and not "the long-whiskered farmer," were the Populists. In 1892 the People's party ticket received only 2.54 per cent. of the vote in Illinois. In Indiana it received only 4 per cent. of the vote; in Iowa, an agricultural State, only 4.65 per cent. of the vote, although Weaver of that State headed the ticket for President. And the vote shows that very few of these votes were cast by farmers. A Populist ticket appeared in Michigan first in 1894. It received 7.57 per cent. of the vote. In 1895 the Populist ticket received 7.2 per cent. of the vote. In Missouri the Populist ticket received 6.88 per cent of the vote in 1894, and 8 45 per cent of the vote in 1895. A Populist ticket was voted first in Wisconsin in 1894. It received 6.81 per cent. of the vote. A Populist ticket was voted first in Ohio in 1895. It received 6.29 per cent. of the vote. Even if farmers cast all the Populist ballots in these agricultural States, it would be far from the truth to call farmers Populists; but an analysis of the vote shows that farmers, even in these agricultural States, cast less than one half of it. The farmers of no other State have been maligned as have those of Kansas. They have been unmercifully ridiculed and abused for being Populists. Yet not they, but the townspeople of Kansas, are the Populists. Take the flood-tide Populist vote of 1892, when the State gave a majority for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Why, then, attribute it to the farmer? To do so, stamps one as either pitifully incompetent and shallow in his observations and judgments, or wilfully dishonest. Instead of being what they are so often pictured to be, the farmers are the most sensible, substantial, and patriotic element of our population, and have never failed to uphold by their votes or their lives the honor and glory of the nation. Instead of receiving recognition and praise from those whose enterprises they have saved from disaster, their action has been persistently falsified and they have been paid only with vilifications and taunts and ridicule of their occupation and their personal appearance from those whose interests they have defended. Maligned and abused and ridiculed, they have kept the faith! In all the history of our country, no other class has shown by its votes such a sublime devotion to principle as have the Republican farmers!

To hold farmers responsible for Populism is not a greater mistake than to suppose that farmers are influenced in their currency views by hostility to city people and their interests. Tens of thousands of farmers' daughters are in the cities, not only as wives of successful men, but the flower of the stenographers, clerks, and teachers there, and the love and pride of the old folks at home. Nearly all of them have deposits in savings banks. I have the honor to know four farmers' daughters, skilled stenographers, diligent workers, honest and virtuous girls, that by using one large room for parlor and bedroom, by preparing their own meals in addition to the hard work of the office, and practising other economies, have each been able to save several hundred dollars, deposited in a Chicago savings bank. Their fathers and brothers would guard those hard made savings almost as they

Weaver—for which the farmers were most loudly cursed. The largest percentage of votes in opposition to the Populists was in the extreme western counties, purely agricultural, without cities—the counties in which nine-tenths of city people think a practically solid vote for the Populist ticket was cast. Here are the votes of these counties: Garfield, Republican, 102; Populist, 69; Finney, Republican, 478; Populist, 338; Greeley, Republican, 241; Populist, 114; Hamilton, Republican, 253; Populist, 186; Haskell, Republican, 177; Populist, 111; Hodgman, Republican, 363; Populist, 223; Kearney, Republican, 219; Populist, 141; Morton, Republican, 106; Populist, 26; and so on, while such counties as Leavenworth, Sedgwick and Sumner, having cities and towns, gave majorities for the Populist ticket. These western counties did even better in 1894, the Republican vote is given first: Finney, 492,—254; Gray, 173—98; Greeley, 175—81; Hamilton, 187—93; Hodgman, 287—152; Kearney, 199—27; Morton, 67—37; and so on. These farmers, on their lonely farms, poor in all but a sublime courage to vote their convictions, had not many votes to give, but as they gave them two to one against the Populists, who will say that they are not like the widow's mite and are greater than the thousands of the counties having towns and cities which heaped up the Populist vote? Since they cast their votes righteously, shall it not be counted unto them for righteousness? Yet for their work at the polls they have received only misrepresentation and ridicule.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would guard the good name of those girls. There are tens of thousands of other such girls having savings bank deposits. Can any one that knows the farmer think for a moment that he would favor legislation that would take away nearly one-half the value of those deposits—legislation that would be indeed "a crime"? Farmers' sons are the large majority of the successful business men—manufacturers, merchants, bankers—of the cities; who that knows them can believe that the fathers and brothers on the farm will vote hurt to the boys in the city of whom they are so proud.

Farmers understand the interdependence of industries. They know that any policy, whether it relates to the tariff or the currency, that reduces the output of factories and the business of merchants, must lessen the purchasing capacity for farm products; that any measure that banks furnace fires and lowers the wages of workingmen must lower the prices of beef and wheat and wool. As a shrewd business-man as well as patriot, the farmer would have every spindle hum, a merry fire at every forge, and every workman's pail well filled. He agrees with the silver monometallist that our great need is more money in circulation, but he believes that to get more money in circulation we must have, not more activity at our mints so much as increased production of our factories under a protective tariff and more confidence in our financial integrity. There is as much money in circulation in the country to-day as there was in the years immediately preceding 1893—years of unexampled prosperity—save the gold called across the sea by the fear of foreigners that we will reach a silver basis and the gold hoarded at home because of the same fear in this country. The money still exists, but it is not circulating as the life blood of trade because unwise tariff legislation has stricken down American industry and created distrust, and because those that have much of our money fear that if they pay it out for stocks or bonds, or loan it to manufacturers or merchants or investors, they may have to receive in payment scarcely more than one-half of its value. What we need to get more money into circulation is not so much more money coined as a greater demand for money to pay wages and the restoration of confidence in the money that we have.

JOHN M. STAHL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AMERICA'S DUTY TO AMERICANS IN TURKEY.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE HON. JOHN SHERMAN, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM OHIO.

BY THE REV. CYRUS HAMLIN, D.D., FOUNDER OF ROBERT COLLEGE, CONSTANTINOPLE.

To the Hon. John Sherman—

Dear Sir: Your illustrious name and illustrious services to the country give great weight to every utterance of your deliberate opinions. With regard to the imperilled missionaries in Turkey, you have said: "If our citizens go to a far distant country, semi-civilized and bitterly opposed to their movements, we cannot follow them there and protect them. Any act of war by us would be accompanied not only by the murder of the missionaries, but of their converts or sympathizers."

Being myself one of the missionaries implicated, and having members of my family—children and grandchildren—still residing in the Empire, having been connected with the Turkish work since 1837, and having resided thirty-five years in the Empire, and being now past the meridian of my eighty-sixth year, will you consider it presumption in me to correct, from my own experience and knowledge, some of the errors into which, from want of intimate knowledge, you have inadvertently fallen?

And, first of all, I did not go into "a country semi-civilized and *bitterly opposed to our movements*," but into a country well known and thoroughly explored, and having many aspects extremely favorable and inviting to missionary effort. Messrs. Fisk and Parsons, in 1820, explored the country of the Seven Churches. Messrs. Fisk and King ascended the Nile in 1823. And before 1827 the missionaries Parsons, Fisk, King, Bird, Goodell, and Smith had explored Palestine and Syria and carefully reported

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the condition of those countries as calling loudly for Christian missions. In 1827 Mr. Gridley travelled from Smyrna to Cappadocia, in Asia Minor, and reported the condition of the country. In 1830 Messrs. Smith and Dwight made a long and careful tour of research, extending from Constantinople through Asia Minor and parts of Mesopotamia, Russia, and Persia. Their report, published in two volumes,* declared the Empire open to Christian missions; not to the Moslems, but to the old and decayed Christian churches, Armenians, Greeks, Nestorians, and others.

Missions had long been established by Roman Catholics, and opposition might be apprehended from them, of course. The land journey of 2,400 miles had been made in safety, as had all the journeys above referred to. No opposition was made by the Turkish government, and none was apprehended in the establishment of missions; and, for more than half a century, none was experienced.

In the meantime, reforms were going forward. The great Sultan, Mahmoud, had broken with the past, had destroyed the Janizaries, and had openly declared that the welfare of his Empire depended upon cultivating right relations with Christian powers and with the Christian subjects of his Empire. He was especially friendly to Americans. When his old-fashioned Turkish fleet was destroyed at Navarino, he employed American naval architects, Eckford and Rhodes, to build a far better one. He treated them with distinguished consideration and personal regard.

When the young Sultan, Abdul Medjid, wished to promote the cultivation of cotton in his empire, having doubtless an eye to the more profitable use of the many useless slaves, he applied to the United States government for aid. The result was that Dr. Davis, of South Carolina, was sent with a few slaves and a model cotton plantation was established at San Stefano. The enterprise failed through no fault of Dr. Davis, who was decorated and handsomely rewarded. A much wiser and more successful scheme was the development of the mining resources of the empire. Again Abdul Medjid, applied to our government, and Prof. J. Lawrence Smith, a gentleman of great scientific attainments and of special skill in chemistry, an author and inventor, accepted an

* New York, Jonathan Leavitt, 182 Broadway, 1833.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

appointment. He made many valuable discoveries, one of which, an emery mine, is of value to the government to this day. When he presented Morse's telegraph to the Sultan, I was invited to assist him. The Sultan said to me, "I hope you find your residence at my capital a pleasant one," and he added many other kind things. After two trials of the telegraph in his palace, he sent to Professor Morse his first foreign decoration, with a framed diploma, in excellent Arabic, addressed to him as "The most learned of the Disciples of Jesus." Americans were specially honored.

In 1830 a treaty was formed between the United States and the Sublime Porte in which was the "most favored nation" article; and as Roman Catholic missionaries had been there for more than a century under the protection of the government and especially patronized by France, our missionaries entered unchallenged and asking for no favor not already accorded to others.

When the great Mahmoud died in 1839, his son Abdul Medjid ascended the throne and immediately issued the historic paper called the Hatti Sherif of Gul-hané, as a new constitution for the administration of his power. Under that, missionaries had all the rights and privileges they could ask or wish. They came and went freely; schools were established; the Bible was translated and printed in all the languages of the Empire, and freely sold.

In 1846, the Sultan authorized the formation of Protestant Armenian churches, although there was an earnest opposition from Roman Catholic and Russian sources. In 1847 he reinforced the permit by a Vizerial order and in 1850 by an imperial firman. The work of the American missionaries thus received the highest sanction of the supreme authority of the Empire. You were under a grave misapprehension of facts when you intimated that we went into "a country semi-civilized and *bitterly opposed to our movements.*" Of course, Roman Catholics and Russians were not friendly to us: but they were not "the country"!

The history of our educational "movements" proves further your great misapprehension of our position as missionaries. In 1840 I opened the Seminary, or Normal School, at Bebek, on the Bosphorus. It continued there prosperously for more than twenty years. When, afterwards, I wanted to establish Robert College, and the combined and powerful opposition of the Russian and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

French diplomats prevented my building, I opened the college in the buildings of the Bebek Seminary—that institution having been transferred to Marsovan. The government absolutely refused to disturb me there.* The seven years' restriction upon building was caused wholly by French and Russian interference. The visit of Admiral Farragut changed the tone of things, and leave was magnificently given. Since then seven other colleges have been established, under the authority chiefly of Abdul Aziz, the predecessor of the present Sultan Hamid.

More than forty seminaries or normal schools and young women's boarding schools have also had the full approbation of government. Many unmarried ladies have been teachers in these schools, and have safely gone back and forth into the distant interior, under the protection of the Turkish government. I plead, therefore, not guilty to the charge of entering a semi-civilized country bitterly opposed to us and leaving members of my family there where our government is under no obligation to secure the rights of American citizens. On the contrary, it was an exceptionally safe and inviting field of labor. More than 400 missionaries, men and women, have given their lives to that work during the past 75 years, and many are buried in Turkish soil.

Another point in your utterance is worthy of remark: "Any act of war would be accompanied not only by the murder of the missionaries, but of their converts and sympathizers."

By "an act of war" you evidently mean the shedding of blood. But when, in all this century, has this been necessary, or been resorted to, in defending the rights of foreigners in Turkey? All the nations of Europe protect their citizens in that Empire without any such "act of war"! They have often made a show of war, by ordering up a war ship, or ships of some kind; and this has always been sufficient. Many years ago, England had a case against Athens which was not attended to; and she sent some of her warships to close the Piræus; and the affair was immediately settled. England sent two of her warships into the Gulf of Smyrna to settle a local dispute between English and Turkish interests. The Turks immediately took the English view of the case, and there was no further trouble. Turkey has many exposed points, such as Smyrna, Mersin, Alexandretta, Crete above all; and she would do almost anything rather than have any one of

* See "My Life and Times," 433-437.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these ports occupied by foreign war vessels with a demand. She keeps her own navy up at anchor in the farthest practicable interior of the Golden Horn, where alone her ships can rest and rust in safety.

Had our country defended the treaty rights of her citizens, as all the nations of Europe have defended theirs, the massacres that blot with innocent blood the last pages of the century would never have been perpetrated, as I shall briefly show.

The present Sultan, Hamid, came to the throne with an inveterate dislike to all Armenians who would not apostatize and thus follow his mother's example. He began his career by displacing them from office. Many hundreds of them were in various offices of government. He next began to oppress their schools with new and vexatious requirements and to spoil their school books by an absurd censorship. Many schools were closed, many school-books destroyed for containing forbidden words, such as "courage," "patience," "patriotism," "progress." In this work he encountered our schools, school-books, and teachers, and began cautiously his war upon them. He has destroyed our school-books printed and issued by the authority of his government and owned by Americans, an invasion of rights perpetrated upon Americans alone. Our government was often appealed to for redress, which was generally promised in the sweetest and most gracious words, of which our diplomats have been very proud. But no penalty was ever exacted, no promise was ever fulfilled, excepting the case of Mr. Bartlett's house, in which the moving force was the threat of an ironclad. Now every outrage thus treated during the last few years has been a distinct permission to go on to greater outrages upon property and personal rights. The Sultan has seen that it is a safe thing to perpetrate every indignity upon Americans and their property, until now the destruction of American property has amounted to nearly $200,000. Not one dollar would have been destroyed had our government from the beginning protected our rights as all the governments of Europe protect their citizens.

It must be remembered that the destruction and the looting of the buildings at Harpoot, Marash, and other places were done in the presence of government officials and troops, and the plea "done by a mob" cannot be accepted.

It must also be remembered that every building destroyed had

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been built in strict accordance with all the laws of building; their plans, measurements and proposed uses had all been laid before the proper authorities and received their sanctions. The government in destroying such buildings and looting them of all their contents of furniture, food and clothing has gone back upon itself in its eagerness to show "its contempt of America and Americans." In all this the Sultan is backed up by Russia. No indemnity has been exacted, or if any demand has been made it is understood that some high Russian diplomat whispers that now is not the proper time to enforce it, and it is dropped. Thus the "Great Republic" is justly the derision of other nations and cowers before a poor Sultan who cannot pay a piastre of his public debt, nor make the smallest loan in the money markets of Europe.

No Turk has yet been punished for robbery, pillage, murder, rape, rapine, torture unto death of women and children, and the horrid work still goes on. Why should it not? The nations, our own nation especially, have for two years been giving the Sultan *carte-blanche* to do as he pleases; and his pleasure is the extermination of all Armenians who will not Islamize, the expulsion of the American missionaries, the destruction of their property, and the showing of himself as superior to all treaties and to all the claims of truth, justice, and humanity towards all men of the Christian faith.

Having now vindicated myself, as I believe, and also my associates in Turkey, from the suspicion of having done anything to sacrifice our right to the protection of our government, I would most earnestly appeal to you to use your great influence to right the wrong which our government has done us, to rescue us from impending destruction. We claim only the treaty rights of American citizens. The missionaries in the field have shown their readiness, if need be, to suffer unto death rather than forsake, in these scenes of blood and torture, the people to whom they have given their lives. Lead, we pray you, the Great Republic, to stretch out her arm for their protection. Secure from the Sultan the rights accorded to other nations, and the blessing of those who are ready to perish will descend upon you.

I remain, with profound respect and admiration, the humblest of your fellow citizens,

CYRUS HAMLIN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WOMAN'S BATTLE IN GREAT BRITAIN.

BY THE REV. PROF. W. G. BLAIKIE, D.D., LL.D., F.R.S.E.

THE great advance in the position of women that has taken place in the British islands within the last few years is due to two great causes, which may be distinguished by a recent parliamentary phrase as non-contentious and contentious. In some departments women have risen without noise or struggle; in other departments they have made good their progress only by war *à outrance*. But in both cases the progress has been made mainly through the same cause; through individual women of rare gifts and courage showing what they are capable of, what gifts they have, and what power to use them; this being followed by the double result of cutting off from opponents their chief ground of objection, and of encouraging less courageous women to venture into the arena, show their capacity, and claim their due.

It is to the contentious department—the region of opposition and struggle—that we wish chiefly to draw attention; but a glance at the more silent and unopposed line of progress will fitly introduce the other.

Foremost in the department of quiet progress, we place literature and kindred arts. A century ago, there was hardly a distinguished female name in all English literature. Hannah More was one of the first to venture into print. Among her contemporaries were Joanna Baillie, Maria Edgeworth, Jane Austen, Frances Burney, and Mary Wollstonecraft, whose *Rights of Woman* made her doubly a pioneer. But to the class of literary ladies before the Victorian era one might apply the famous line of Virgil, with the necessary change of gender:

"*Apparent rarae nantes in gurgite vasto.*"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Within the last fifty years, however, female writers have become thick as leaves in Vallombrosa. It is in the lighter departments of literature that they chiefly appear—poetry, fiction, stories for children, essays, letters, and sketches; and here they probably equal in number the whole array of contemporary male writers. And some of the names are stars of the first magnitude. Mrs. Hemans, Mrs. Browning, Christina Rossetti, Mrs. Alexander, George Eliot, Miss Braddon, Mrs. Oliphant, Miss Martineau, the Brontës, Miss Carpenter, Mrs. Jameson, Mrs. Charles, Mrs. Humphry Ward, Edna Lyall, and others form a constellation as brilliant as the Pleiades. Nor is light literature their only field. In science Mrs. Somerville led the way, commanding universal respect for the grasp and fulness of her scientific purview. More recently, Miss Ormerod's contributions to natural history have gained her the post of Entomologist to the Board of Trade. Miss Giberne's *Sun, Moon, and Stars,* with the imprimatur of Professor Pritchard, of Cambridge, has been received with remarkable favor, and reached a circulation of between twenty and thirty thousand copies. Miss Buckley's *Short History of Natural Science* takes a kind of encyclopedic grasp of modern scientific progress. Even in the border land of philosophy and theology, Miss Caillard's *Progressive Revelation* shows an interesting mastery of modern speculation without the sacrifice of steadfast faith. As travellers, some ladies have shown wonderful courage and capacity, notably Isabella L. Bird, now Mrs. Bishop, who began her literary career many years ago with *The English Woman in America,* and her fame as a traveller with her *Six months in the Sandwich Islands* and *Letters from the Rocky Mountains.* There is every reason to believe that when Girton and Newnham have reached maturity, the contributions of women to the higher departments of literature and kindred arts will become more and more numerous and important.

It would be an interesting inquiry: What has been the net result of the thousand and one contributions to our literature that have recently flowed from female pens? Have they in any way modified the tone of English literature? Have they given it more grace and purity? Or have any specific results arisen from works having a definite practical aim? Upon that wide and somewhat difficult inquiry we cannot enter now, but all would readily allow that by far the most remarkable case of lit-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

erary triumph with a specific aim has been on the western side of the Atlantic. *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, in its influence on public opinion and public action, stands as yet unrivalled.

Philanthrophy is not a new field for women, for sisterhoods of charity and mercy have been from time immemorial. But in our day female philanthropy has assumed a new phase, and entered on a wider career. Instead of creeping about in veiled obscurity, doing good by stealth, and not finding it fame, women have come out as originators of great philanthropical enterprises, in which, after a time, they have commanded approval and admiration on all sides. Elizabeth Fry, in Newgate, introduced a new era of prison administration. With her three great gifts, according to her daughter Katherine, "her dignified and stately presence, her exquisite voice, and her unruffled sweetness of expression," she was a splendid pioneer. Almost by her single example she settled the question of woman's right, when duly gifted, to speak in public; for who, as the late Dr. Guthrie used to say, could hear her most melting appeals without being convinced such gifts as hers were meant to be used. Miss Nightingale, with her warm heart and ready hand, achieved a great revolution in the art of nursing. In her work among navvies, recorded by Miss Marsh in her *English Hearts and English Hands*, it was shown for the first time what a remarkable influence a cultivated and loving Christian lady could exercise on the most rugged of men—how wonderfully she could capture their hearts and mould their wills. Mrs. Bayly's *Ragged Homes and How to Mend Them* was a convincing testimony to the success of woman's work in the slums. Miss Annie McPherson was the pioneer in the rescue work that has transferred tens of thousands of children from neglect and misery at home to a career of honesty and prosperity in Canadian homes. Other ladies without number in our day have made their names alike honored and fragrant by work among soldiers and sailors, by homes of rest, homes for cripple children, leagues of pity, sea-side resorts, fortnights in the country, cabmen's shelters, boys and girls' clubs, and a thousand other contrivances for lessening the burden and brightening the monotony of toil. Surely it was a great blunder in Mr. Dickens to make his Mrs. Jellybys and Pardiggles types of our active philanthropic women. For female philanthropy, as a whole, there is now but one voice of commendation and admiration, and if the kindly and gentle

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spirit which has thus shown itself could only be brought to bear on certain other departments of labor, terribly exposed to the east wind, much might be done to overcome the antipathy of class to class and to hasten the day

"When man to man the warld o'er
Shall brithers be, for a' that."

But the course of true love has not run quite smoothly in female philanthropy. Besides showing mercy in their own way, women have presumed to claim a voice in the management of some of our great charitable institutions. They have actually sought to become guardians of the poor! Who can tell the virtuous horror of the fine old companies of managers and directors when it was proposed to give women a place on the Board of Guardians? Were they, men of business and men of brains, to be disturbed and worried by the fancies and dreams of ignorant, flighty, unpractical women, who could no more manage an institution than they could direct the movements of the British Navy? Bring in women, it was said, and you will bring in an utter chaos of disorder. But it began to be seen that in the case of the poor, half being of their own sex, the help of women might be of no ordinary use. Did men or women understand best how to feed them? And might not women have some reasonable ideas about clothing, and nursing, and managing the children; and if the old people were cranky and ill-tempered, might not women be as successful as men in soothing their irritations, and throwing a few gleams of sunshine into their lives? Was it strange that such views prevailed? It is but yesterday since Miss Slack and other friends began to fight this battle, yet already nearly a thousand women are guardians of the poor in England, and doubtless the number will rapidly increase.

But the effort to make women eligible as guardians of the poor was a mere skirmish. The great tug of war has been in connection with other objects, notably these three: higher education generally, and admission to the universities; medical education in particular, and medical practice; and the municipal and political suffrage, especially in the election of members of parliament.

But for these struggles the way was silently prepared, partly by the process, characteristic of all advancing civilization, which lays more stress on the individual, both in the family and in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

state, recognizing more fully individual responsibility and obligation :

> " For every creature, male as well as female,
> Stands single in responsible act and thought ;"

and partly by specific efforts to impress the public mind with the rights and proper place of women. We have referred to Mary Wollstonecraft's *Vindication of the Rights of Women*, published in 1792, which made a stir in its time, but was not powerful enough to do more. To this we may add the erratic championship of Shelley, and the more effective advocacy of John Stuart Mill and Professor David Masson, buttressed by such powerful works as *Aurora Leigh*, *Shirley*, and Tennyson's *Princess*. Thackeray and George Eliot contributed to swell the stream, and more recent writers, including Charles Reade, George Meredith, and Thomas Hardy at home, and Tolstoï, Ibsen, and Bjornson abroad, have helped to make the atmosphere of public opinion more favorable than at any previous time to the claims of woman.

We proceed to trace the line of battle in the three directions that have been named.

1. *Higher education and admission to the universities.* It is a full half century since the desire arose to burst the envelope which had hitherto confined female education to a very small class of subjects, and obtain access to those richer fields of knowledge in which the other sex freely expatiated. The first formal step in this direction was taken in 1848, when the " Governesses' Benevolent Institution " made arrangements with professors of high talent and standing in society to open classes in all branches of female education, and for that purpose started an institution in Harley Street, London, known as Queen's College, followed in 1849 by another in Bedford Square, known as Bedford College. These institutions, however, were self-contained, nor had the idea arisen as yet of connection with any university. It was not till 1856 that any movement began in that direction. In that year, Miss Jessie Mariton White addressed a letter to the Registrar of London University, inquiring whether a woman could become a candidate for a diploma in medicine, if, on presenting herself for examination, she produced the requisite certificates of study and character. The opinion of counsel having been taken, the Senate replied that " they did not conceive themselves empowered to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

admit women as candidates for degrees." Six years later, in 1862, Miss Elizabeth Garrett (now Mrs. Garrett Anderson) requested to be admitted as a candidate for matriculation, but with the same results; and a motion in the Senate to apply for modification of the charter of the university, making female students admissible to its degrees and honors, was lost by the casting vote of the Chancellor. Finding this too bold a game in the then state of public opinion, the friends of the cause endeavored to secure an intermediate position, hoping through it to advance to success in their higher aim.

What they now asked was liberty to pass the university local examinations which had just been instituted. To this request the University of Cambridge acceded under certain conditions. On December 4, 1863, the first examination was held and was fairly but not wholly successful.* But it was only a private examination, and the next effort was to gain the benefit of publicity, and the greater stimulus to exertion on the part of the girls which this would secure. The Senate so far agreed, but objected to making the names public. It would be altogether unsuitable in this brief paper to go into all the steps of the struggle, and the varied success it met with from the universities of London, Cambridge, Oxford, and Durham. But even where girls were granted a place in local examinations, it was found that this step was altogether insufficient to fulfil their legitimate aspirations. Many young ladies (as many schoolmistresses testified), desired to go much further than the standard of local examinations. A new movement was accordingly concerted. It was resolved to establish a girls' college that should hold in relation to girls' schools and home teaching a position analogous to that occupied by the universities towards the public schools for boys. The final result of this resolution was the establishment in Cambridge of the now famous colleges of Girton (1873) and Newnham (1875). Application was made and granted for the use of the examination papers used for the mathematical tripos and the classical tripos in the university. In 1872 one lady passed the examination for the mathematical tripos, and two for the classical. In Oxford, which was behind Cambridge, an association for promoting the education of women

* For details on this subject we are indebted to a pamphlet entitled *Women in the Universities of England and Scotland*, by Emily Davies (herself a pioneer in the movement), 1896.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was founded in 1878 and in 1879. Lady Margaret Hall and Somerville Hall were opened for the reception of resident students. Notwithstanding their concessions in the matter of examinations, these two universities have hitherto declined to take any steps for conferring degrees on women.

The University of London, which is not a residential institution, but a body for conducting examinations and conferring degrees, has advanced further. The question of degrees came up again, and after considerable discussion, "the Senate and Convocation agreed to accept from the Crown in 1878 a supplemental charter, making every degree, honor, and prize accessible to students of both sexes on perfectly equal terms." This was a great step in advance; but the old jealousy asserted itself in a provision of the charter that no female graduate of the said university should be a member of Convocation unless a resolution should be passed by the Convocation to that effect. On January 17, 1882, however, it was resolved by that body that "female graduates be admitted to Convocation."

In 1895, the University of Durham (which is of comparatively recent origin) became "mixed," a supplementary chapter having been obtained enabling the university to grant degrees to women in all the faculties except theology.

The movements of the universities, in this whole matter, have shown a remarkable conflict between opposing forces: the strong conservatism of ancient custom and privilege on the one hand, and the sense of justice and obvious popularity of the woman's cause on the other. Oxford, where the conservative spirit is strongest, has been the slowest to move; Cambridge, with its great liberalism, has been more responsive; while the two modern universities, London and Durham, have gone the whole length and placed men and women on an equal footing.

But what of the Scottish universities? We shall have more to say of them when we examine the movement for medical education; but, apart from that branch of the subject, where great opposition was shown, a favorable response was given to the desire for advanced female education. Edinburgh took the foremost place in opening its local examinations to girls in 1865. Four years later, a system of classes for women was introduced, taught by professors of the university, and a certificate, registered in the books of the university, was given to ladies who in any three or

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more science or art subjects passed special examinations up to the standard of the M. A. degree. In Glasgow, similar steps were taken, and in 1883, the Association for the Higher Education of Women was incorporated under the name of "Queen Margaret College." In St. Andrews in 1876, the university instituted an examination and diploma for women with the title of L. L. A.

But what gave the greatest impulse to the cause in the Scottish universities was the Act of Parliament of 1889, which gave power to the University Commissioners to enable each university to admit women to graduation in one or more faculties and to provide for their instruction. The Commissioners issued an ordinance, which, on June 28, 1892, became law, making it competent to the University Court of each university to admit women to graduation and to make provision for their instruction within the university in any or all of the subjects there taught, either by admitting them to the ordinary classes, or by instituting separate classes for their instruction. This enabling ordinance is now in operation; and, though it has not been taken advantage of to the full, graduation has become possible; a considerable number of women are preparing for it, and on some degrees have been already conferred.

2. We turn now to what has been far the keenest and the fiercest campaign in this cause—the struggle for medical education with a view to medical practice. Dr. Sophia Jex-Blake's book, *Medical Women,* supplies us with the facts in this great warfare, in which she herself, with remarkable courage and persistency, bore the leading part. Her story of the battle is prefixed by a very interesting introduction in which two historical facts are very clearly established; that again and again in former times women practiced both medicine and surgery in various countries of Europe, and often with great success and *éclat;* and that the employment of male practitioners in midwifery cases is restricted almost wholly to the present century. Some of these medical women received the degree of M. D., and even of LL. D., from distinguished universities, and were held in great esteem by the whole profession.

In more recent times the first lady who received the degree of M. D. was an American, Miss Elizabeth Blackwell, who, after much difficulty, obtained it from a college in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the State of New York. The University of France has ever looked with a friendly eye on women, and it was there that the first Englishwoman who became an M. D., Miss Elizabeth Garrett, received her degree in 1870. The next was Miss Mary C. Putnam, an American lady, who quietly continued to pursue her studies in Paris during the two sieges in 1870 and 1871. The first Scottish graduate in medicine was Miss Agnes McLaren, who received the degree of M. D. from Montpellier in 1878.

But we are anticipating. When Miss Jex-Blake and other ladies determined to devote themselves to medical practice, it would have been natural to turn to one or other of the universities of Europe that would have been willing to receive them. But by a recent law, regulating medical practice in Great Britain, the diplomas of foreign schools would not have sufficed to place their names on the lists of legally-qualified practitioners. Even Miss Garrett, brilliant though her examination at Paris had been, could get her name on the register only in virtue of a license which she held from Apothecaries' Hall. Moreover, as the authors of the new movement were not fighting for their personal interest, but on behalf of their sex, and as it was obviously most desirable that medical ladies should obtain their degree from a source that was beyond cavil, it was resolved that their line of battle should be ordered, and all their energies directed, towards getting the medical degree from a home university.

Accordingly in March, 1869, Miss Jex-Blake approached the University of Edinburgh. A few of the professors were friendly, more were neutral, and a few bitterly opposed. One or two of the medical professors were so vehement in their opposition that it became apparent that no stone would be left unturned to defeat the purpose of the ladies. At first, however, the Senatus acted mildly, and passed a resolution which seemed to encourage female students of medicine, and four additional ladies came forward for the purpose. But afterward the Senatus recalled this resolution on the plea that it was found to be illegal, or beyond their power. This vacillation exposed them to very bitter criticism; at first they allowed the ladies to enter, and thereafter resolutely shut the door in their face.

We have no space to enter into all the details of the conflict with the university. Now the request was for matriculation; now

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for separate classes for women, to be conducted by the professors or their assistants; now for leave to attend the ordinary classes along with the male students; now for relaxation of a rule that prevented them from taking more than four classes outside the university. As long as the university was favorable and allowed separate classes, all went well, and at the examinations the ladies distinguished themselves greatly, and one of them became entitled to a valuable prize. But this gave rise to a new element of opposition on the part of the students, some of whom gave vent to their jealousy in the most discreditable way, by personal rudeness to the ladies, and by offensive anonymous letters reflecting on their character. Out of this treatment arose an action for defamation brought against Miss Jex-Blake for declaring that a student who had treated her rudely was intoxicated at the time; after appeal the action was decided against her, the costs which she had to pay, or would have had to pay had friends not interposed, amounting to £915.

The enemies of the movement in the medical faculty of the university originated another law plea; they went into court to contest the legality of the concessions that had been made on behalf of the lady students. The decision of the Lord-Ordinary was in the ladies' favor, but the case being appealed to the whole court, a majority of the judges decided against them. This decision was given in June, 1873, and the ladies were again called to pay the expenses on both sides. As far as the university was concerned, its doors were now finally shut against them, and, as no other way of obtaining their object seemed feasible, they appeared to have suffered a total defeat.

While the struggle for admission to the university was going on, another pretty little battle of similar character was proceeding in connection with an application for admission to the Infirmary. Very naturally the ladies desired the opportunity of so much attendance at the Infirmary as would enable them to obtain the necessary certificate. They were willing to accept separate instruction if it should be thought impossible to allow them to go through the wards with the other students; they were willing to be limited to a mere fraction of the wards, if only they could obtain the certificate. If it should be objected that operations of a particular kind were unsuitable for ladies to witness, the answer was that the nurses witnessed them, and no one objected to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that. But again and again their applications were refused. At last, in 1872, by a small majority, the Court of contributors decided in their favor. Dr. Guthrie, who had always been on their side, was present—it was the last public meeting he ever attended. He said: "it seemed to him monstrous that when the country committed the fortune of the State to a woman's hand, women should not be entrusted with administering a dose of physic or preparing a blister."

Application to other universities, Durham and St. Andrews, led to nothing, and it became evident that an appeal must be taken to another tribunal. Parliament and the government were now appealed to, and not without success. But, in the first instance, a bill introduced on behalf of lady students was lost. The centre of operations was now transferred to London. A school of medical study for women was set up, and it was hoped that some of the nineteen Examining Boards that had authority to examine would accept the certificates of the school. But here again difficulties and disappointments arose, even though in 1876 an act was passed permitting these boards to admit women to examinations if they chose to do so. The case seemed as hopeless in London as it had been in Edinburgh, and as a last resource the ladies turned to Dublin.

And here at last they conquered! "The Irish College of Physicians was now (1876) prepared to recognize the London School and to admit women to examination on the same terms with men. Early in the following year," writes Miss Jex-Blake, "several of us who had already obtained degrees in foreign universities, were admitted to examination, and in this way, women, after an interval of twelve years, again found their way on to the National Medical Register." Arrangements were made about the same time allowing the ladies to attend a hospital in the neighborhood of their London School. Thus, at last, a path was made for ladies, first to prosecute medical study, next to attend a hospital, and finally to obtain authority to practice; and though many doors continued to be shut against them, they attained their object, in the main, and were enabled to rest, or rather to work, in peace. The Scottish Universities Act, to which we have referred, made things easier in Scotland, although it cannot be said that the sexes are yet on a level there.

It is worthy of note that one of the considerations that helped

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

greatly to recommend the movement was its bearing on the great Empire of India. Shut up in the zenana, Indian women are beyond the reach of male practitioners. It is said that on one occasion, when a male practitioner did have a female patient, she would show him her tongue only by making a hole in her veil. The prospects for women in India are now greatly brighter, so far as medical and surgical assistance is concerned, and the missionary societies are giving all encouragement to medical lady missionaries. And there is this to be said for medical ladies in India, that out of the many millions of women who may desire their aid not so much as one will have to dismiss a male practitioner.

3. We turn now to the *suffrage* movement. The battle here, though one of great interest, has not awakened the keenness of feeling that was shown in connection with medical education, for the obvious reason that no one has a personal interest in opposing the admission of women to the suffrage. In opposing the medical ladies, practitioners of the other sex often showed that they were not above the trades'-union feeling, as it was called; like the people of Ephesus, they deemed their craft in danger. But the question of female suffrage is free from all such complication. It is indeed a foregone conclusion, for it is not easy to say why a woman of property should be debarred from exercising the suffrage which her gardener, her coachman, and her tenants may all exercise. In point of fact, the women of Great Britain now exercise the municipal suffrage, the School-Board suffrage, the Board of Guardians' suffrage, and the County Council suffrage. Besides this, they are eligible on school-boards and boards of guardians, though not on town or county councils.

In 1892 a bill in favor of women's suffrage was defeated in the House of Commons by a majority of 202 to 179 It was introduced by a Conservative member, but the vote was not given on party lines. It is a somewhat striking fact that, though the movement is based on Liberal principles, it has much support from Conservatives. Lord Salisbury and Mr. Arthur Balfour have declared themselves in its favor, while the bill of 1892 was opposed by Mr. Gladstone, Sir W. Harcourt, Mr. Chamberlain, and Mr. Labouchere. The experience of the Primrose League leads the Conservatives to believe that female suffrage would operate in their favor. This, however, is only the accident of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the moment; it is essentially a Liberal measure, although it does not find a place in Liberal programmes.

In the last report of the "Central National Society for Women's Suffrage" (June 26, 1896), it is stated that the result of the last general election had been to increase the number of friends in Parliament and diminish that of opponents. Reference is made in the report to a recent memorial to the House of Commons which bore the signatures of 257,000 women, of whom 57,800 were Londoners, 140,700 English provincials, 51,270 Scottish, and 7,320 Irish. The signatures included the heads of nearly all the colleges for women, and a large proportion of the head-mistresses of high and other public schools for girls, and of women serving on boards of guardians and school boards. At the same time it was admitted at the meeting of the society that the movement had fallen into a state of langour, and that energetic measures were needed to quicken it into such a condition of activity as would secure its triumph.

As the poet says:

> "She who did this thing was born
> To do it; claims her license in her work,
> And so with other works. Whoso cures the plague,
> Though twice a woman, shall be called a leech:
> Whoso rights a land's finances is excused
> For touching coffers, though her hands be white."

We have no room in this paper to take notice of many of the lesser operations that illustrate the progress of the woman's battle. And we can give but a few concluding lines to the question: What is to be the result? Where is the movement to end? What is finally to be the position of woman and her relation to those pursuits that have ordinarily been confined to the other sex?

First, we may say that the arbitrary rule by which certain pursuits and studies were held to be fitting, and others unsuitable, for women, must now be repealed. In place of it we must recognize the rule that no office or employment can be held unsuitable for a woman who shows that she possesses the requisite gifts for it, and in practice fulfils its requirements well. As "manifested fitness" has been the sesame that has opened so many doors during the past generation, so it must be held to be equally applicable in days to come.

On the strength of this principle it must be held that no leg-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

islative obstacle should be placed in the way of women to bar them out from employments for which they show themselves fitted; and that no social prejudice should be allowed to tyrannize where there should be a fair field and no favor.

But what will follow? A rush of women into all the professions, berths, and offices hitherto belonging to men? By no means. The strongest forces of nature will still remain to draw women generally in the old directions. A select few with eminent gifts will share important positions with the other sex, but the rank and file will find their place in the old spheres. It is well for women to know that marriage is not the only outlet for their lives, but marriage will ever continue to be the outlet for the great majority. "Love's young dream" will not be extinguished. The management of the household will ever be woman's peculiar care. Instincts not to be overcome will continue to draw them to occupations that are peculiarly suited to their strength and their tastes. The functions of maternity will still be surrounded with a charm of their own. It may be true that even in physical strength the woman may by training and exercise become the equal of the man. But physiologists all tell us that this can only be achieved apart from the functions of maternity. So long as she exercises these functions, her frame as a rule will be more delicate, her strength weaker, her features more refined, her manners more gentle. And these qualities will in some degree be imparted to her daughters. Nature will thus place her barrier against most of the occupations of the other sex. The female character will retain its refinement, its gentleness, and its grace. The divine rule, which has given to man the first place in the human family, will suffer no infraction; it will still be true that "the head of the woman is the man."

W. Garden Blaikie.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PLAGUE OF CITY NOISES.

BY J. H. GIRDNER, M.D.

MAN is entirely dependent on his five senses for all the knowledge he receives concerning the material world. The nerves which supply the organs of hearing, sight, smell, taste, and touch, or the tactile sense, are the only channels through which information with regard to objects of nature can be obtained; they are consequently the primitive source of all conscious relation with the rest of creation. Destroy these channels, or suspend their operation, and consciousness ceases, and the individual is placed precisely on a par with the vegetable kingdom. In fact, physical man might properly be defined as five senses mounted on stilts, and endowed with the power of reason and locomotion.

The impressions made upon the organs of hearing, sight, etc., are transmitted over their respective nerves to the sensorium as raw material, if one may use such an expression; and there they are transformed into sensations, prior to being reflected to other parts of the organism.

It at once becomes apparent what a vast influence the operation of the senses must exert on our mental, moral, and physical well being. It is also surprising how little care and thought are taken, not alone by the individual, but also by constituted authority, to protect these delicate organs from unnecessary irritation. Such neglect is especially manifest with regard to the sense of hearing, and it is this fact which brings me to my present purpose, viz.: to call attention to the painful and injurious effect of city noises on the whole nervous system, and to make such suggestions as a careful study of the subject seems to warrant. I do not wish to be considered an alarmist, or hypercritical, but it seems to me the time has come when something should be done to lessen

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the constant and largely unnecessary outrages committed on the sense of hearing of the residents of large cities.

The deleterious effect of the constant shock or concussion of unpleasant and non-musical sounds on the auditory apparatus is demonstrated beyond question by the fact that nearly all boiler makers, according to the highest authorities on diseases of the ear, are hard of hearing. There is a well-recognized condition of congestion, amounting sometimes to inflammation, in the internal ear, which otologists class under the general name of *boiler makers' disease;* but this is liable to occur also, and does occur, in all classes of persons who are exposed, as the inhabitants of the metropolis of New York are, to the continual rattle, roar, and screams which assault their ear drums at nearly all hours of the day and night.

Professor Roosa, a world-famous specialist on diseases of the eye and ear, writing on the effects of excessive discordant sounds on the acoustic nerve, says: "That it must necessarily be as harmful to the nerve of hearing, as is excessive light to that of sight, is a natural deduction from our knowledge of the effects of the waves that produce these two senses, and all experience confirms the belief that there may be an acoustic neuritis produced by noise as well as optic neuritis caused by exposure to a glare."

The ceaseless assault of confused and discordant noises on the auditory apparatus is not confined in its destructive effects to those organs alone, but the brain and the whole nervous system are likewise made to suffer in consequence of it.

The act of hearing should not require attention. Under ordinary circumstances, no effort calling out consciousness of the operation is elicited. The vibrations, or sound waves, are conducted to the sensorium, where they are interpreted and duly considered. But when a Babel of discordant sounds and noises of every degree of harshness and force is poured into the auditory canals, an effort, indeed, is required to catch the sounds we wish to interpret, and to eliminate those which are not only of no consequence, but positively painful. This sustained effort of selection and elimination is an incalculable strain and source of exhaustion to our nervous energy. The fact that persons who live in the midst of confusing and discordant noises, as do the dwellers in large cities, become in time accustomed to them, is no

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proof that the noises are any the less destructive and exhausting to the brain and nervous system. Such persons have only become expert in discriminating and selecting the sounds in which they may be interested at the moment.

The habitual drunkard can take large potations of alcohol into his system without its producing any of the ordinary signs of intoxication. He has grown accustomed to the effects of the stimulant; but does any one suppose, that for this reason, the injurious effect of the alcohol on the tissues of his body is any the less pronounced ?

Observe the confusing and almost stupefying effect on the inhabitant of the way-back rural district when he visits the city for the first time. He is the butt of every joke, not necessarily because he has a faulty sensorium ; in this respect he may be, and often is, far better off than those who laugh at him ; his trouble is, that he has no skill in selecting and discarding among the million sights and sounds that rush in upon his consciousness.

There can be no question but that a vast amount of nerve energy is expended on the sense of hearing and discriminating noises in a city like New York. Add to this the wear and tear, the jarring and actual pain produced on the sensorium by the endless roar in which we live, and you have a most potent factor in the production of that bane of modern city life, neurasthenia- or nervous prostration.

If the above facts are true for the well, how much greater are the deleterious effects of city noises on the sick. Recognizing the detriment to their patients from this source, most of our hospitals have succeeded in having asphalt pavement put down in the streets near them, and thus have secured some relief. But not all the sick are in hospitals; tens of thousands are sick at their homes, and except where they have sufficient "pull" to be allowed to put tanbark over the cobble-stones in front of the house, they must grin and bear the suffering and injury imposed upon them by the jarring sounds of the street.

Opposition to unnecessary noise and noise-makers, and the demand for reform in this respect, is not based alone on the annoyance they cause, though that would be quite sufficient to justify rebellion. The main ground of our contention is the broad physiological truth that rest is necessary to health, and that over-stimulation and irritation of the brain and nervous sys-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tem, whether it takes place through the auditory or some other set of nerves, is essentially disease-producing.

It is, of course, impossible to state exactly what part noise in New York city plays in the death rate and the sick list, but every physician knows it must be considerable. How often the physician in his daily rounds finds it necessary to prescribe "perfect quiet" in order that the flickering spark of life remaining in the patient may be brought back to a healthy flame. Yet in nine cases out of ten, that perfect quiet he deems so important cannot be had, owing to the noises from the street. Especially is this true in warm weather when windows must be kept open.

The makers of unnecessary noises in New York are not confined to any one class. All are more or less guilty, from the church people to the organ grinder and the street peddler. Any one who studies this subject and observes carefully will be astonished and disgusted at the reckless disregard of each for the health, peace, and comfort of all the others.

If you should go for a walk in Fifth Avenue on a fine afternoon and all sorts and conditions of people were to begin to assault you with switches, you would call the police; they would be promptly arrested and properly punished. What for? They have not killed you, or maimed you, or drawn any blood, and you are apparently none the worse for these assaults. What they have done is to irritate the nerve terminations of one of your five senses, viz.: that of touch, or the tactile sense, and through the nerves of this sense they have made you conscious of painful sensations. This is exactly the treatment you do receive from these same people, by their unnecessary assaults on another sense, viz.: that of hearing. But should you ask the authorities to interfere in this case, you would likely be arrested yourself, and your sanity inquired into. This remarkable inconsistency—the prompt protection of one of our senses from assault, and the utter disregard of another—seems almost unaccountable, except on the ground of custom and habit. It is simply another instance of patience and long suffering under abuse, for which the American public has become famous.

It is impossible to conduct the ordinary affairs of life in a city without producing a certain amount of noise. It is also true that a given disturbance produces a much louder and more penetrating sound in the city than it does in the country. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

high, continuous walls of the houses on both sides make the street partake somewhat of the character of a whispering gallery, and the sound waves reverberate from wall to wall, thus greatly increasing their power of penetration.

These facts are the strongest arguments in favor of suppressing the *unnecessary* noises.

The noises and noise-makers in New York City are legion. Some are necessary, some are partly necessary, and some are wholly superfluous, and should be treated as public nuisances.

The best way to study the city noises, it seems to me, is to divide them into groups.

1. Noises produced by horses and wheeled vehicles.

2. Noises produced by street peddlers, beggars, street musicians, etc.

3. Noises produced by bells, whistles, clocks, etc.

4. Noises produced by animals other than horses, as cats, birds, etc.

5. All noises which come from the inside of our houses, as persons learning to play musical instruments, training the voice, etc., etc.

6. Explosives.

Nearly every kind of city noise will find its proper place under one of the above headings. It would be interesting to study each individual in these six groups, and to point out which are necessary and which unnecessary, and to suggest the remedy in each particular case, but it would lead us far beyond the proper limits of a magazine article. I propose to select one or two examples from each of the groups for detailed study, and to make such suggestions as seem proper, and allow the reader to go on with the remainder of the group himself.

The first group, that is, noises produced by horses and wheeled vehicles, includes street cars, steam cars, elevated cars, and all kinds of carriages whether used for business or pleasure. These are largely necessary noises, but much can be done to lessen their annoying effect. Asphalt pavement on all streets is the one thing needed above all others. It is practically a noiseless pavement, or should be, so far as the carriage itself is concerned: only the clatter of the horses' feet is heard, and that must be put down as unavoidable until we get horseless carriages. Asphalt pavement in New York is, however, far from being noiseless. The old

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

loose cast-iron manhole cover, which appears at frequent intervals in the otherwise noiseless asphalted street, sends forth a sudden and ear-splitting sound every time a wheel passes over it. I know of no single source of noise that is so annoying, especially to the sick, as this one. This noise is wholly unnecessary, and there is no excuse for its continuance. Manhole covers, which are themselves asphalted and properly fitted to their frames, make a continuously smooth pavement, and are noiseless. These should take the place of the miserable old rattle-traps now used. This is, of course, the business of the Public Works Department.

The cartman who drives through a street with the body of the cart banging the shafts at every stride of the horse ought to be stopped by the police, and made to fasten the body firmly to the frame.

A few pieces of old burlap placed between the iron rails, when a load of that material is to be drawn through the streets, would prevent one of the worst brain-bruising assaults we suffer from.

The second group—noises produced by street peddlers, beggars, street musicians, etc.—are entirely unnecessary. These noise-makers should be treated as public nuisances. The few thousand engaged in buying and selling rags and bottles, watermelons, etc., have no right to disturb the peace and quiet, and to actually injure the health of the rest of the inhabitants of a city by hourly yelling their wares through the streets. No hardship could result to these people; for does any one suppose that the traffic in rags, bottles, watermelons, etc., would be injured by having it conducted decently and in order?

The mendicant, whose mournful cry for alms in the public street is so common and annoying, should be taken to one of the many institutions which public and private charity has so lavishly provided for such unfortunates.

As for the so-called street musicians, it seems that any din or clamor an Oriental or South Sea Islander chooses to call music is sacred, and must be accepted at par without a protest by the rest of us.

The third group, according to our arrangement, includes noises produced by bells, whistles, clocks, etc. These are nearly all unnecessary. Church bells and clocks were useful at a time when congregations were scattered, and clocks and watches were rare. But none of these conditions exists in New York in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these days. Watches and clocks are always at hand to tell us the hour for church and for business, and the sweet quiet of the Sabbath morning should not be disturbed by the clanging of bells on church steeples, nor should our sleep at night be disturbed by their clocks pounding out the hours.

Every citizen should be required to provide a box where his mail could be deposited and the shrill ear-splitting, useless postman's whistle should be abolished.

Noises produced by animals, such as cats, birds, dogs, etc., which constitute our fourth group, are unnecessary. Think of the vast increase in the aggregate number of hours of restful sleep that would be obtained by the inhabitants of this city if all the cats were removed from our back yards, to say nothing of the decrease in soul-losing profanity. An ordinance requiring all persons who wish to keep a cat to take out a license and keep said cat in the house, and all other cats to be removed to the pound, is all that would be necessary.

Noises from the inside of our houses comprise the fifth group. If the music teachers could be induced to take their pupils into the country to train their voices and teach them instrumentation, life for many would be all the sweeter. The well-to-do folks set a bad example. At a fashionable reception my lady's drawing-room becomes a pandemonium of shouting, screeching women, each doing her best to make herself understood.

The sixth and last of the groups is explosives. Let us be thankful that this torture is confined mostly to one day in the year, the Fourth of July. The day following our last national holiday, I called on a patient, a weak, emaciated, exhausted woman, who had for days been hovering between life and death. She was much worse than the day before, and I wish the City Fathers could have gazed upon her pale, weary, drawn face and heard the pathetic voice as she said: "I could not get a minute's rest yesterday nor last night owing to the noise in the street; every explosion seemed to be tearing the nerves from my body." And this was only one instance out of thousands. These Fourth of July noises in the city are not only unnecessary but are a gross outrage. If Young America must celebrate this day with explosives, make him get out of the city to do it.

To complain of abuses and to point out the remedy is not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enough to insure reform. The newspapers for a long time have called attention editorially and otherwise to the need of checking the reckless noise-makers. Letters from sufferers are constantly published calling attention to specific cases of unnecessary noise, but these efforts are sporadic. No concert of action or systematic crusade has been attempted to lessen the noises in New York city, and until that is done I see no hope of any improvement.

I believe the solution of the problem will be found in the organization of a society. Call it the Society for the Prevention of Noise. It should have a charter and certain powers and responsibilities conferred upon it by the Legislature. It should be modeled somewhat after the pattern of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, or the Gerry Society. It should make a study of the noises of the city, and through its own powers, and by advice and coöperation with the various city departments suppress such noises as are unnecessary, and reduce those that are necessary to the minimum of disturbance. Such a work could not fail to be of immense benefit to the public both in the matter of comfort and health. And the last word on the advantage of a city of comparative peace and quiet cannot be said, until account is taken of the assistance such a state of things would render the individual in securing that inward peace which passeth understanding.

J. H. GIRDNER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LATE SESSION OF PARLIAMENT.

BY JUSTIN M'CARTHY, M.P.

THE session of 1896 has been a season of surprises. The Tory government began with a magnificent majority in the House of Commons. Only one government in my recollection ever had so great a following. The normal majority of the Tory government amounted to 150. Here, surely, was a government which might go anywhere and do anything. In the ordinary course of affairs a Prime Minister thinks a steady majority of thirty a very satisfactory possession—a steady majority of fifty something to be proud of. But the Tory government started at the opening of the session a few months ago with their steady majority of 150, and what have the Tory statesmen made of it? They have made failure after failure; they have created clouds of confusion darkening their future path; they have spent months of barren controversy ending not merely in defeat but in utter discredit, not to say degradation, to themselves. Now, as they still can command on ordinary occasions their 150 majority, it is necessary to give some preliminary explanation of the causes which brought about such extraordinary results.

The fault was in the government itself, not in its stars. The government, to begin with, was composed of two discordant factions. There were the regular Conservatives, like the Duke of Devonshire, Mr. Balfour, and Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; for I always regarded the Duke of Devonshire as Conservative, even when, being then Lord Hartington, he occupied a place in several Liberal governments. The other faction was that led by Mr. Chamberlain, who having begun in the House of Commons as a far-advanced Radical had left Mr. Gladstone on the question of Home Rule, and because he could not agree with Mr. Gladstone on the question of Home Rule had suddenly transformed himself

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

into a Tory, denounced everything that he had once applauded, proclaimed his intense satisfaction at being at last in the company of "English gentlemen," and finally accepted high office in the Tory government. Now there can be no doubt that Mr. Chamberlain has rendered great service to the Tory party. But for him they would in all human probability have failed in their effort to obtain hold of power just now. Still there was and is a great deal of grumbling in the Tory ranks about the liberality of the rewards which were given to Mr. Chamberlain and his followers. Mr. Chamberlain certainly did not do quite as much for the Tories as Coriolanus did for the Volscians, and yet we know that the friends of Tullus Aufidius grumbled savagely over the position allotted to the Roman renegade. Moreover, there is a feeling among the Tories that the demands or exactions will become greater and greater as the time goes on and the difficulties of the government increase. There, then, is one of the internal elements of discord corroding the strength of the government.

Another trouble is found in the personal attitude of Sir John Gorst. An American reader may not, perhaps, know much about this source of trouble, and I am therefore inclined to spend a few sentences in describing and explaining it. Sir John Gorst is at present what would be called in other countries the Minister of Education. He is a very able man—so far as my judgment goes, the ablest man in the Conservative administration. He was once a member of the famous Fourth party, which was started by the late Lord Randolph Churchill, and which consisted of four men, Lord Randolph Churchill himself, Mr. Arthur Balfour, Sir Henry Drummond Wolff, and Mr. Gorst, as he then was. That Fourth party worried the Tories just as much as they did the Liberals, and when for the next time a Tory government came to be formed the members of the fourth party had to be counted with. Lord Randolph was made Chancellor of the Exchequer; Mr. Arthur Balfour obtained some office which gave him a seat in the Cabinet; Sir Henry Drummond Wolff was made an Ambassador, and Mr. Gorst received some appointment which left him out of the Cabinet. He is not in the Cabinet now; he has never, so far, been in the Cabinet. Yet he is a man of great ability, as I have said, and he has a close knowledge of all questions concerning education, labor, and socialism; he has an open mind, is full of practical sympathy with the working

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

classes; is a man of wide and varied experience and is an excellent parliamentary debater.

Why, then, should the Tories not give him a position adequate to his deserts? Well, if you question them, or some of them, at all events, they will tell you frankly that Sir John Gorst is not a man easy to get on with; not a man on whom his chief can always rely at a crisis; that he is, in fact, a sort of gifted, high-minded "crank." There was a marvellous instance of this peculiarity a little more than five years ago. Sir John Gorst then delivered his famous, I might almost say his immortal, Manipur speech. He was Under-Secretary for India when a trouble broke out in one of what are called the protected states there; that is to say, the states in which England exercises a sort of protectorate. The actual, although not the titular, reigning prince of the state was accused of having stirred up a rebellion against the protecting power. He was tried, convicted, and promptly put to death. The whole question, was, of course, brought up in the House of Commons. The Liberal leaders charged the Tories with gross injustice in the putting to death of the prince. Their chief speakers insisted that the prince was very popular in Manipur; that he was an able, capable, and beneficent ruler, and that his people all resented his doom as an outrage. Sir John Gorst as Under-Secretary for India had to defend the policy of his government. How did he defend it?

The whole House listened in wonderment to his defence. I do not profess to give his exact words, but I do profess to give the genuine meaning of his speech. No doubt, he admitted, the prince was able, beneficent, and highly popular. No doubt he was a good ruler. No doubt his people loved him. But then, he went on to say, that is exactly the sort of man whom England could never tolerate in India. That is the sort of man who comes most awkwardly between us and our Indian policy. We could not put up with him. We are bound to put him down.

Now, to make the impression of this speech the more clear, I may say that every one who knows Sir John Gorst knows that his sympathy goes with the native races everywhere, and that his whole soul revolts against the injustices which are too frequently inflicted on them. Therefore, it became clear that Sir John Gorst, as Under-Secretary of State for India, was simply delivering a long, elaborate, and scorching satire on the policy of all

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

English governments in India. Nothing of the kind had ever been heard in the House of Commons before under such conditions. The speech gave rise to a new Parliamentary phrase. A man who openly in the House satirizes his own colleagues is said to be "Manipuring." Nothing of the kind was ever heard since in the House of Commons until the present session, when Sir John Gorst, as Minister for Education, turned upon and satirized and chaffed and flouted his own leader, Mr. Arthur Balfour, about the principles and the management of the Education Bill.

Now I, for one, do not believe that Sir John Gorst performs these strange freaks because of any feeling of resentment for the lack of appreciation shown towards him by his official chiefs. According to my impression, the truth is that the instincts of the natural man, the enlightened and liberal man, force Sir John Gorst now and then outside the limits of official discretion. He probably still thinks he is a Conservative, but I should say that he ought to be an advanced Radical. However that may be, it is certain that the one great failure of the session so far has been the Education Bill which it was the official duty of Sir John Gorst to introduce to the House of Commons. The government had the task of endeavoring to reconcile to their Education Bill three great parties or sects in the state—the hierarchy and members of the Anglican Church, the hierarchy and members of the Roman Catholic Church, and the English, Scotch, and Welsh Nonconformists. I am not going to ask my American readers to follow me into a detailed description of the measure. I only want to point out that the great question at issue was whether the schools endowed by the state for the poor shall be denominational or undenominational. That is, whether under any condition the State shall pay out of public funds for the religious instruction of the children of the different sects. The Nonconformists insist that the money of the state—that is, the money of the tax-payers—shall only be given to pay for those studies which are common to all denominations. Many of the Anglicans and all the Roman Catholics object to sending their children to schools from which religious teaching is excluded. They therefore form voluntary schools, and they demand that when the teaching of these schools is up to the government standard the schools shall receive as much help from the state as is given to the ordinary board-schools.

There, in substance, is the whole question. The government

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

undertook to deal with it in a measure which was proclaimed to be the great legislative scheme of the session. Now, one might have thought that on a question so distinct in all its bearings, so incessantly debated in public and in private during many years past, there ought to have been no great difficulty in finding out whether any compromise whatever was possible, and if so, what that possible compromise might be. Only after the measure had been introduced by Sir John Gorst did it seem to have dawned upon the minds of the Tory statesmen that if any compromise were possible, they at all events had got hold of the wrong notion of a compromise. The Nonconformists denounced the bill, the Anglicans were divided upon it, the Roman Catholics would not have the bill as it stood and would only consent to its being read a second time in the hope of altering it to something entirely different. The more the measure was debated the more the difficulties in its way came out. Many thorough Tories openly condemned the scheme. Sir John Gorst, as several papers said, took to "Manipuring again." As I have already told my readers, he satirized and scoffed at and flouted the chiefs of his administration. Mr. Chamberlain kept altogether aloof from the discussion. Mr. Arthur Balfour, when he did intervene in the debate, made things worse rather than better.

Mr. Arthur Balfour has disappointed in this session of Parliament all the hopes that had been formed of his capacity as the leader of a great party. Now, Mr. Balfour is a man very popular in the House of Commons. All of us who know him are charmed by his genial manners and impressed by his varied culture. But if he is going to be a great parliamentary leader he must entirely remodel himself from the Arthur Balfour of 1896. So far as I can guess, the truth is that he did not care three straws about the Education Bill. He is not a man likely to become absorbed in the details of a measure which has nothing to do with University or academic education, but is only concerned with the commonplace teaching of the children of the poor. I am convinced that when he spoke upon the measure in the House of Commons he sometimes did not know in the least or care very much what he was talking about. In this he was totally unlike Sir John Gorst. Whether the measure was a good one or a bad one, Sir John Gorst at all events knew all about it and understood thoroughly the purpose and the effect of every

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one of its clauses. Moreover, Mr. Balfour is a dreamer rather than a worker. He takes to politics as he might take to any other form of occupation which amused him for the time. He cannot throw his soul into the details of dull and commonplace schemes of legislation. He is a philosophic doubter about everything, and especially about the House of Commons and parliamentary eloquence. I heard him once say that he had no high opinion whatever of mere oratory. He admitted that John Bright was undoubtedly a great parliamentary orator, but said that he should not care in the least to make speeches like those of John Bright. Now, if a man wants to succeed in any line of life almost the first condition is that he must greatly desire success in it. A man must give himself wholly to the House of Commons and its work or he cannot become a great parliamentary leader. Mr. Balfour never did give himself wholly up to the work of the House of Commons. His one great anxiety always seemed to be to get away from the House of Commons as often as he could and to go and do something else. He never, I am told, indeed I think he has said so himself, reads the newspapers. Now a man might be a great scholar who never read the newspapers; he might be a great power in literature without ever reading the newspapers. I may go a little farther and say that in some fields of literature a man might be a better worker because he never read the newspapers. But the man who undertakes to lead the House of Commons and to conduct the affairs of a great administration without reading the newspapers is like a man who undertakes to steer a ship without taking any account of winds and waves and stars and weather. When Mr. Balfour came to discuss the Education Bill he soon showed that he was out of touch with everybody, even including the members of his own Cabinet. He is a very clever and graceful parliamentary debater; he is, taken all around, one of the best debaters in the House of Commons, now that the one supreme debater has quitted the parliamentary field. But he showed to very poor effect in the debates on the Education Bill. What was the result? The result was that after weeks of precious time had been wasted in hopeless discussion, Mr. Balfour had to throw up the sponge and withdraw the bill. With all his great majority he could not force the bill upon the House of Commons. Had he persevered in trying to do so, a considerable number of his own men would have openly revolted against

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

him. He did not fall in battle. He merely quitted the field. No failure so utterly ignominious to a ministry has ever occurred in my time. More than half the session was occupied in fruitless, futile debate on this measure which was to have been the great triumph of the government, and which had to be unconditionally surrendered at the last.

The programme of the session was crammed full of measures, everyone of which was to have proved to the country what practical administrators the Tory statesmen were and what good they could do for England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales now that Mr. Gladstone and his Home Rule policy were out of the way. What now is to come of all these promises? There is no time left to give a chance to any substantial part of the legislation which the government announced that it was its business to carry to success. The one great declaration of the Tory statesmen when they took office was that they were going to do substantial good for the people of Great Britain and Ireland and not to waste any time in absurd and impossible schemes of Home Rule for Ireland. Ireland they were going to satisfy by a great measure of land-tenure reform. England they were going to satisfy by an Education Bill and various other measures of an equally practical nature. Scotland was to have something all to herself, and Wales some peculiar measures of propitiation. Each and every measure was to be of the practical and not the visionary order. Now I think the most disputatious mind will admit that the first business of practical statesmanship is to be practical. It is of little use calling one's self a practical statesman if one brings in measures which cannot be carried into law. But this is exactly the condition of the present Tory government. Whatever anyone may say of Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill, it must be admitted that he carried it through the House of Commons and that it was rejected only by the House of Lords. Whatever may be thought of Mr. Balfour's Education Bill, it must be admitted that it had to be withdrawn from the House of Commons. There is actually no time left in the present session during which to carry any substantial measures through Parliament. The Tory members are almost all of them gentlemen who are given up to the moors at the regular season, and whom the stoutest cart-ropes could not hold in their places at Westminster after the 12th of August. Most of the government measures will be withdrawn

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

just as the Educational Bill was withdrawn. Nobody cares about the Irish Land Tenure Bill, except a few Irish landlords, and these do not care about it in its original form, and only stick to it in the hope that it may be so much improved in their sense as to give them some direct advantages. Therefore there is no rashness in the assumption that the session of 1896 is an absolutely wasted session. In truth, the huge majority of the Tories was, in one sense, a disadvantage to them. It made them too confident and cocksure.

Then the government was singularly unfortunate in its foreign policy. Some of the misfortunes were due to the policy itself; others came from events and causes over which the government had no control. The country saw with amazement a new Egyptian campaign started, about which the government could not or would not give any explanation whatever. The events in South Africa, and especially Dr. Jameson's raid, told heavily against the Tory statesmen, although it cannot be denied that Mr. Chamberlain showed great courage and skill in his manner of dealing with a very serious and unexpected crisis. All this, however, was distinctly damaging to the government in public opinion. What the outer public saw was that the Tory government had brought us into nothing but trouble abroad, and was able to do nothing whatever for us at home. On one or two occasions of great moment lately the government majority suddenly shrank to little more than half its ordinary number. One man was lax in his attendance because he did not like what the government had been doing in one way; another man stayed at home because the government had refused to oblige him in some other way; a third man did not see why he should tie himself to the House of Commons for the sake of a set of ministers who were forever wrangling among themselves; a fourth man was sulky because he did not see why "Joe Chamberlain" should be allowed to boss the whole show—and so on. It is very possible that if the government had had but a small majority these troubles would never have assumed so serious a magnitude. Men would have swallowed their private or personal grievances and felt bound to stand by their leaders all the same. But, as the condition of things was, it became quite easy for Jack to say to himself that there was no reason for his sticking to the House, inasmuch as Tom, Dick and Harry were certain to be in close attendance there, and therefore

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he went off with a light heart and not the slightest compunction of conscience.

Now of course we all know that where there is a great majority that majority will not under ordinary conditions dwindle all of a sudden. It would take several sessions to bring the Tory majority to vanishing point, unless something very unexpected were to happen. But then in that wide field of foreign policy which the Tory statesmen have lately entered with so light a heart, there is no telling what news any day may bring. Nothing so much discredits a government in England as any real and striking reverses in its foreign policy. The Liberals are always complaining of the present government because of its vast expenditure for the increase of the strength of the navy. A great many devoted Tories on the other hand insist that the government is not doing half enough for the navy. A disaster in Egypt would shatter the strength of any administration which could not feel it had the whole support of the country behind its policy. The present government could not possibly feel that it had any such support, because it never condescended to take the country into its confidence, and, as I have already said, either could not tell or would not tell what the new war movement was all about. A sense of utter insecurity was thus generated which may not have a very practical effect if everything goes right, but may have a very practical effect, indeed, if anything should go wrong. If Mr. Balfour were less of a philosopher and an amateur, I should think he must feel very anxious about the present crisis. But I dare say he will console himself with divine philosophy. To him it possibly seems that, to use the once familiar saying, "there's nothing new, and there's nothing true, and it don't signify." No one can doubt that the government has got into serious trouble even amongst its own followers and adherents by the singular feebleness of its policy in regard to the Armenian massacres. England had much better have let the Armenians alone if she had not made up her mind to take a firm stand on their behalf. The Tory government, by threatening Turkey without having any intention of putting the threats into force, did only harm to the unfortunate Armenians. The Tory threats offended the Sultan and the Turkish ruling populations, and exasperated them more than ever against the deserted Armenians. Religious hatred and racial hatred flamed out with ten times keener

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

force when England intervened, and above all when it came to be gradually made clear that England's threatened intervention meant nothing at all. We all remember what happened in the sudden intervention of the immortal Don Quixote. Don Quixote saw a man scourging his unfortunate apprentice. Don Quixote intervened and insisted that the apprentice must be scourged no more. Then he mounted his horse again and went his way. The moment his heroic figure disappeared below the horizon the man tied up his apprentice again and scourged him worse than ever. This was exactly what happened with regard to the English intervention for the protection of Armenia. I am not by any means inclined to class Lord Salisbury with any manner of Don Quixote. I am not inclined to admit that the Tory government had really much of the chivalrous and heroic purpose which belonged to Cervantes's deathless hero. But the effect was much the same. As soon as the Porte got to know that nothing serious was to come of England's intervention, the Turkish pashas tied up the Armenian apprentice over again and scourged him more cruelly than ever. Now I have been in Turkey and I know something about the ruling classes there. I am perfectly convinced that a strong, stern word from Lord Salisbury would have settled the whole trouble in Armenia. There is an old story about a brief exchange of despatches between two chieftains in the far-off legendary days of my own country. One chieftain wrote to the other, "Pay me my tribute, or else —." The other chieftain concisely replied, "I owe you no tribute and if —." I wish we could have had some such exchange of correspondence in regard to the Armenian troubles. I wish England had written, "Let the Armenians alone or else —," and that Turkey could have had the nerve to reply, "I'll not let the Armenians alone, and if —." Then we should have found ourselves face to face with the whole difficulty. But I am afraid that even in that case Lord Salisbury would have accepted the ultimatum and caved in. No man in his senses, I think, could believe that Turkey would have dared to resist in arms the power of England. But then, of course, I should be told that there was the question about the attitude of Russia. Russia would support Turkey, Russia would bring France along with her, Russia would do this, that and the other. I do not believe that Russia would have ventured to prevent England from acting on the rights given to her by a special clause in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one of the conventions with Turkey, which authorized England to use her influence for the protection of the Christians in Armenia. I am not an Englishman, but what I complain of in Lord Salisbury and his colleagues is that they seem to have undervalued altogether the strength and the authority of England. I utterly deny that England has fallen so low in her influence and power that she is unable, for very fear, to insist on the carrying out of the conventions which were especially entrusted to her care. It would be very hard indeed to convince me that Russia would have ventured to join with Turkey in a war against England because England insisted upon the recognition of agreements for the protection of Christians in Armenia to which Russia herself was a consenting party. I observe that the United States government has got the better of the Ottoman Porte in many questions regarding the treatment of American subjects in Armenia. Now the United States have got a very small navy, and, roughly speaking, no army at all. But everybody knows that America can have an army and can have a navy whenever she is in need of both, and the Sultan knew very well that when dealing with America he had to deal with a government which would do what it said. The Sultan knew perfectly well also that Lord Salisbury had not the faintest notion of putting his threats into execution, and therefore he snapped his fingers in England's face and felt quite certain that he could accomplish the unseemly performance without the least dread of serious consequence.

Of course it has been asked why England should be plunged into the horrors of war for the sake of the Christians in the Turkish dominions. That is what would be called, in House of Commons phraseology, the "previous question." If England had made up her mind that she would not run any risks for the Christians in Asia Minor her only other duty was to leave them to their fate. Lord Salisbury's government might, of course, have indited some touching little homily to the Sultan and pointed out to him how wicked it was to allow his Christian subjects to be oppressed, and warned him that by such goings-on he would forfeit the respect of all well-regulated nations and then left him to his own reflections. But the truth is that in the first instance Lord Salisbury did bully the Ottoman government and then allowed it to be quite clear that he meant bullying and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nothing more. I heard John Bright once say that he was opposed to all English intervention in foreign affairs because he was sure the intervention would come into actual practice at the wrong time, or on the wrong side, or not at all. I so far agree with him that I think it would be infinitely better if England were to stand absolutely aloof from all intervention in foreign affairs than to do as she did in this wretched Armenian question, and intervene just to a point which only insulted and maddened the dominant race, and took no steps to mitigate the sufferings of the subjected population. "May the vengeance of Heaven," says Sydney Smith, "fall upon the crowned conspirators of Verona; but I hope so far as England is concerned they may be left to the vengeance of Heaven." It would have been far better if the English Tory statesmen had made up their minds to leave the Sultan and his pashas to the vengeance of Heaven, or else had lifted up their hearts and tried to be the instruments of Heaven themselves. I think no one who watches closely the course of English public affairs can doubt that the Tory government must have suffered severely even in Tory public opinion from the utter feebleness of its policy in regard to the Christian subjects of the Porte. I meet with a great many Tory political men of generally independent opinions, and I never met with any such men who did not say that England ought to have intervened to some practical purpose or not to have intervened at all. Among the many influences likely to be more and more injurious to the government of Lord Salisbury, even among his own followers, is this impression, growing day by day, that England has been made to play a poor and pitiful part, and even a very damaging and disastrous part, in her unfortunate attempt to protect the Christian populations of England's personally protected pet, the Ottoman Empire.

JUSTIN MCCARTHY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AN INDUSTRIAL OPPORTUNITY FOR AMERICA.

BY E. SOWERS.

FEW of the great modern industries have had a more varied and checkered career on the way to final success than the manufacture of sugar from the beet.

In 1747 Marggraf, a modest scholar of Germany, read a paper before the Berlin Academy of Sciences, of which he was a member, in which he announced his discovery of a method of producing sugar from the beet; he explained the processes of manufacture, and exhibited samples for the inspection of the Academy; he also expressed his belief that great practical benefits would follow from it, and that Europe would find in that root the basis of an immense industry. The Academy received the announcement with incredulous surprise, and no doubt regarded the opinion of Marggraf as to the importance of his discovery as the dream of an enthusiast and a visionary. Yet his products appealed to the senses in attestation of the verity of his discovery. We doubt if another instance can be found in which the sequel proved that the discoverer at the outset had so just an insight into the scope and magnitude of his discovery, or a truer view of its value and importance. Marggraf was one of the small class of men who were then earnestly devoting themselves to the investigation of those sciences whose glorious possibilities they dimly saw, and faithfully labored to produce. He was poor and without the aid of commercial or political influence. He had watched with cautious zeal the development of his discovery; he had applied all available tests to detect any error in his methods, or any fallacy in his reasonings; and having done this he confidently submitted his discovery and his methods to the Academy at Berlin. It was all he could do. The common fate of discoverers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was his, for thenceforth his discovery slept in undisturbed repose for half a century.

In 1797 Achard, a pupil of Marggraf and who shared his master's faith and confidence in the value of the discovery, announced to the Berlin Academy the results of his own improvements in the methods of producing sugar from beets. These improvements were of such a nature as to kindle hope and expectation in the minds of the doubtful and indifferent. The discoveries of Achard had early attracted the attention of Baron de Koppy, who devoted one of his estates in Lower Silesia to the culture of beets, erecting a factory for the manufacture of beet sugar in 1805, and placing both estate and factory under the control of Achard. So great was Achard's confidence that he built a factory on his own estate at Cunern, and on his own account embarked as well in the culture of the beet as in the manufacture of sugar. These enterprises were so successful, under the wise and prudent management of Achard in the financial and manufacturing departments of the business, as to be deemed, in a practical way, brilliant successes. The new industry steadily grew in Germany, and the quality of the products was of such merit and excellence as to sustain with credit rigid tests in comparison with the best samples of sugar produced from cane. Indeed, in respect to quality and excellence, and in ability to serve equally as well all uses to which it may be applied, it must be conceded that beet sugar in less than fifteen years after its first manufacture had won its right to a place by the side of the best sugars produced from cane. It should be stated that William I., King of Prussia, notwithstanding the distresses of his kingdom by reason of war, gave substantial aid to the new industry by exempting from taxes land devoted to the culture of the beet and factories used in the making of sugar, and by liberal loans to assist the manufacturers, many of which he afterwards released without payment. In 1799 Achard announced the discovery and his improved methods of manufacture. He presented samples of his products to the Institute of France at Paris, and expressed his belief that by this method sugar could be produced from the beet at a cost of six cents a pound. The Institute received the announcement with great satisfaction, and were deeply impressed with the possibilities of the discovery, and of its importance and value. A committee was at once chosen from those deemed best fitted to make

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the investigation, to whom the subject was referred. A close examination was begun which extended as well to the culture of the beet as to the methods of manufacture. In due time the committee reported; and this report was so favorable as speedily to lead to many attempts in France to manufacture sugar from beets. These attempts in the main were so successful as to merit and receive imperial favor and support. In a few years the subject came to be viewed with much interest in France; the products of their manufactories were so large and of such excellent quality as to justify the belief in 1813 that a new industry of the utmost importance and of vast public benefit would be built up in France. Among the rulers and statesmen of Europe the Emperor Napoleon alone clearly saw the magnitude and value of the discovery, and from the outset he favored and encouraged in a substantial manner every interest involved in the subject, and to his favor and support in large measure is due its rapid development and its taking at last a permanent place among the industries of France.

But it should be remembered that the commercial conditions in Europe from 1800 to 1815 were such as to favor and stimulate the production of beet sugar. During that time wars were almost continuous. The commerce of France and of the German States was nearly driven from the seas. Sugar was then produced only in tropical countries, and mostly in the West Indies. The prices per pound for the common varieties during this period in Germany ranged from twelve to thirty-five cents, the best quality of refined sugar sometimes bringing ninety-five cents a pound, and this, too, at a period when the estimated annual consumption per capita was less than two pounds. The conditions of the market and the estimated annual consumption during this time in France were substantially the same as in Germany. It is manifest that these conditions would tend greatly to stimulate the production of beet sugar, and would promise liberal profits on the capital invested. The rapid enlargement of the industry during that period in France and Germany, and the quantity and the excellence of the products, were such as to justify the belief in its complete ultimate success. But the fall of Napoleon, in 1815, and the return of peace again opened the ports and markets of the world. This change in the conditions of trade at once presented a grave problem to the new industry. Can it compete with the products of the cane-growing lands of the tropics? or will that competition

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

crush and destroy it? In due time we shall see the answer which time and events shall give.

Let us briefly note the reception given to the new industry by the people of the leading nations of Europe. In Germany the authority imputed to the Academy at Berlin, the favorable regard of the King and government, and the almost instant success of the new industry by reason of the excellence of its products, there gained for it a respectful hearing on its merits. The gay and volatile wits of France noted the fact that the discovery was of German origin, and for many years in spite of surprising results the new industry was the butt of wit and sarcasm, which abated only after the clearest proofs of the success of the new enterprise. The commercial supremacy of England gave to the opinion prevailing among its commercial classes a weight and authority in Europe which belonged to no other nation. The opinion of these classes in England respecting the production of beet sugar was plain and outspoken; while few, if any, seem to have made any effort to study the subject, yet ignorance was not deemed to disqualify one from holding and expressing an unqualified opinion as to the folly of the claim that any benefit could come from the new discovery; indeed, the subject was deemed too contemptible to merit an investigation. It was assailed with a storm of abuse and ridicule such as seldom before had been known. The press swarmed with articles aiming to bring the new industry into contempt and derision; the stage in play and farce sought to impress its patrons with a conception of the folly of attempting to extract sugar from a root fit only to be food for beasts; the clubs deemed it a proper target for wit and a fit subject for ridicule; the newspapers and periodicals taxed the skill of illustrators for grotesque embellishments in aid of every attempt at ridicule to the end that an industry might perish which at bottom was feared as a menace to a great commercial interest of England. Webster in his speech on the tariff in 1824 expressed the views then held by the commercial classes in this country in the following terms:

"Nor have we been referred to the attempts under the same system to make sugar from common culinary vegetables, attempts which serve to fill the print shops of Europe, and to show us how easy is the transition from what some think sublime to that which all admit to be ridiculous. The folly of some of these

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

projects has not been surpassed, nor hardly equalled, unless it be by the philosopher in one of the satires of Swift, who so long labored to extract sunbeams from cucumbers."

It is obvious that Webster's knowledge of the subject was obtained from purely English sources; and that the knowledge so derived was so crude and defective as even then to be worthless.

But the storm of wit and ridicule in due time spent its fury, and a calm succeeded. It soon became manifest that those who had best studied the subject, and who best knew the facts respecting it in France and Germany, had unshaken confidence in the new industry. The decade following 1815 brought to the new enterprise its severest trials. During that time the factories in France and Germany were mostly closed, and the fields once devoted to the culture of the beet were applied to other uses. But in a few years the industry and energy of the people had so far restored the trade of Europe as that commercial demands for certain products had increased beyond all former precedents. The demand for sugar had increased one, two and threefold, till the crude and wasteful methods of production then existing in the tropical sugar producing countries were taxed to their utmost and yet failed to supply the demand. In this increased demand will be found a potent factor in solving the problem of the longer continuance of the beet-sugar industry in Europe. In fact the volume of increase had become so large as to surpass the recent exaggerations of wit and ridicule. Under these conditions plans were soon formed to revive the industry in Europe. The culture of the beet was renewed and enlarged and the factories again were opened. In 1835 the industry in France and Germany had fairly started under the new conditions; and that of France was so fortunate as to come for a time under the influence of the sagacious and prudent Delisse, to whose wisdom and courage the ultimate success of the beet-sugar industry in France is greatly indebted.

We submit the following table showing the production of beet sugar in France at intervals of ten years:

In 1829-30 (August 1 to July 31)	4,380 tons
" 1839-40	22,784 "
" 1849-50	62,165 "
" 1859-60	126,479 "
" 1869-70	282,136 "

In 1873 the production had increased to 409,916 tons, while in 1889-90 the production was 750,000 tons.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The annual consumption per capita in France in 1830 was two pounds. For the decade beginning with 1840 the consumption in France increased nearly fourfold. In 1865 the annual per capita consumption was fourteen pounds; while in 1890 it had become twenty-six pounds.

As this industry originated in Germany, so also shall we find there its greatest development. The same causes which depressed and almost ruined it in France from 1815 to 1829 also operated with like disastrous results during that time in Germany. But the same causes which tended to revive the industry in France also produced a like effect in Germany, and in a few years the culture of the beet was largely increased and the number of factories were rapidly multiplied.

The following table will show the production in Germany for the years named, and will serve also to show the uniform and steady increase of the production:

	Sugar, tons.	Molasses, tons.
For 1840	13,445	8,955
" 1850	52,586	19,877
" 1860	126,526	35,224
" 1865	180,000	50,544
" 1871-72	186,442	63,892
" 1881-82	599,722	150,813
" 1889-90	1,213,689	240,797

Such an increase in production for half a century, during which every influence that tends to stimulate or depress it was at times present and in active operation, can leave no doubt of the sure and firm foundation on which the industry at last rests in the commercial world.

The following statement will show the exports of sugar products for the years named:

In 1876-77	57,953 tons
" 1886-87	643,340 "
" 1889-90	718,985 "

These statements tend to show the growth and magnitude of this industry in Germany. It is there no longer an experiment; it has gained a place among the great industries of the nation, nay, of the world; and it promises well to maintain the position which after a long and severe contest and with many reverses it has at last won. In 1890 the people of the United States paid to the manufacturers of Germany $16,000,000 for about 200,000 tons of beet sugar imported into the United States, nearly three

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

times more than they paid that year for any other article imported from Germany.

That portion of the United States in and near the latitude of the lakes and extending from ocean to ocean seems to unite in happy proportions all the elements that tend to the production of the sugar beet as good in quality as are anywhere grown. Parts of Kansas, Nebraska, the Dakotas, and California and Utah, have already been devoted to the culture of the sugar beet, with such results as respects quantity and excellence as to give good reason for expecting a brilliant future for the new industry.

The rich soils of California and Utah, their warm and even climate, leave no want in these respects unsupplied; and when irrigation is added the yield is surprising as well for its abundance as its excellence. The production of beet sugar in the United States was:

In 1891	12,004,838 lbs.
" 1892	27,003,322 "
" 1893	44,836,527 "

Of this quantity Nebraska produced in 1891 2,734,500 lbs.; in 1892, 3,808,511 lbs., and in 1893, 5,835,900 lbs. In 1892 California produced about 20,000,000 lbs., and other parts of the United States about 3,000,000 lbs. Nebraska and the Dakotas seem to be specially adapted to the culture of the sugar-beet, and in Nebraska also is found one of the most successful manufactories of beet sugar. There, to a natural richness of soil is added, in the season of rapid growth, a sufficient rainfall to supply the needed moisture, while the temperature for the months of June, July, August, and September is so high and even as to bring the beet to full maturity early in October. The farmers of Nebraska seemed to have learned their advantages in this industry, and the quantity of land now annually devoted to the culture of the beet is steadily increasing, and meantime a better understanding of the methods of cultivating the beet has led to results beneficial as well to the farmer as to the manufacturer. Indeed, in Nebraska and the Dakotas, the opinion now seems to be quite prevalent that the sugar beet will equal in profit to the farmer any crop there grown. The experience of the growers of the beet and of the manufacturers of beet sugar, hitherto, in this country, has been much the same as of the like classes in France and Germany. Indeed, it now seems probable that the late improvements in the methods of manufacturing beet sugar, and a better

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

knowledge of the conditions which tend to increase the yield of beets and to improve their quality, have solved for us the problem of the profitable cultivation of the beet for the farmer, and of the making of beet sugar for the manufacturer.

The conditions in the United States for the development of this industry for the past few years have not been favorable. The repeal of the bounty clause in the late tariff act, and the withholding of bounties payable under it till the late decision of the Supreme Court, with the importation of foreign sugars free of duty, have brought the beet growers and the manufacturers of beet sugar into free competition with the sugar producers of the world. It is quite probable that the late increase of the national debt will lead to the imposition of duties on imported foreign sugars, and that in this way some measure of protection will be given to domestic sugar producers. We have no *data* at hand of the production of beet sugar in the United States for 1894 and 1895. The UnitedStates spends annually about $135,000,000 for sugar, of which more than eight-tenths goes to foreign countries. We consume one-fourth of the exported sugar product of the world. The magnitude and the value of the trade is clearly shown by this vast annual expenditure.

A summary of a few important facts respecting this industry may be of general interest. The yield of sugar-beets varies from twelve to forty tons per acre. The best land with good cultivation and a favorable season will yield from twenty to thirty-five tons per acre, but the crop would be hardly profitable at a yield of less than twelve tons per acre. In California the greatest production from a single acre of land was a little more than forty tons of beets; but this is an unusual yield. The estimated cost of production per acre is about fifty dollars. In the present condition of the methods of manufacture, from eight to twelve pounds of beets are required in the making of one pound of sugar; the quantity varies according to the greater or lesser richness of the beets in sugar. The price changes with the conditions of the market. About four years ago beet sugar from Germany was landed on the wharves of New York at a cost of three dollars and eighty-one cents a hundred pounds. It rarely now costs above five cents a pound. Very great improvements in the processes of manufacture have been made since 1835. Then from four to five per cent. of the beet could be converted into sugar, as against

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

twelve to sixteen now; then the cost of production per pound was eight to twelve cents, against two to four now. In 1893 the average cost per pound of manufacture in the United States was three cents; and twenty-four thousand acres of land was that year applied to the growth of sugar-beets, which brought to the farmer an average price of four dollars and fifty cents a ton. In 1893 there were seven beet-sugar manufactories in the United States with a capital of about two million dollars. The statistics respecting this subject in the United States for 1893 (and this was one of the poorest seasons for production) show that the sugar product from the beets grown on an acre of land was from 3,661 to 4,620 pounds. As respects quality and fitness for any use to which sugar is now applied, it is not questioned that beet sugar is in all points the equal of cane sugar.

The annual consumption of sugar per capita in England is sixty pounds; in France and Switzerland it is twenty-six pounds; in Germany it is eighteen pounds; while in the United States it it is forty-four pounds. France, Germany, and Austria now produce beet sugar enough for home consumption; and but little sugar is now imported into either of these countries, while Germany and France annually export large quantities. Fifty years ago ninety-four per cent. of the annual sugar product of Cuba found a market in Europe; now that proportion of its production is sold in the United States.

We submit that these facts respecting the growth and development of this industry in Germany show that the prevision of Marggraf in regard to the value and practical importance of his discovery, and that it would become the basis of a great industry, was accurate in every particular. So also was the confidence of Achard, manifested when he announced the discovery to the Institute of France, as to its importance, and as to the price at which by this process sugar could at last be produced, fully justified by the course of events. For a series of years in France and Germany this industry was favored by duties on foreign sugars, by bounties, by exemption from taxes, and by taxes on imported sugars; till the vast increase of consumption, cheap labor, the joint skill of producers and manufacturers, have given it at last such strength as to enable it to compete successfully with the sugars produced from cane. In 1892 the manufacturers of Germany sold to English purchasers nearly six hundred thousand

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tons of beet sugar, all of which was the product of their own fields and manufactories. If France, Germany, and Austria can obtain from beets grown on their own lands and made by their own manufacturers their supply of sugar for domestic uses, and have left besides three-fourths of a million tons for annual exportation to foreign countries, why should not the farmers and manufacturers of the United States grow the beets and make the sugar needed for domestic uses, and so save for all the wages and profits incident to such an industry? It cannot be doubted that the natural conditions in the United States are as favorable for this object as they were in France, Germany, and Austria; and hence no reason in the nature of things exists why this industry should not flourish among us, nor why our farmers, manufacturers, and capitalists should not save this large annual foreign expenditure, and assist to further diversify our industries, and increase the skill of our artisans, by a new addition thereto of immense value and of great practical usefulness.

E. SOWERS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE COMING STRUGGLE ON THE NILE.

BY ARTHUR SILVA WHITE.

EGYPT is entering on a critical phase of her development as a modern nationality. It is not too rash to predict that the events of the next year or so will definitely determine her position as a factor affecting the European political system. For over a decade that position has been equivocal, owing to the correct attitude of Great Britain, who desires to redeem her promise of evacuation, but sees no present prospect of the concomitant conditions being fulfilled. The persistent opposition of France to the British occupation, partaking largely of vexatious obstruction, undoubtedly retards the emancipation of Egypt from foreign control; and, in view of the compromising situation on the Soudan frontier, its strength will now be put to a definite test.

The newly inaugurated Nile campaign is the ostensible cause of the derangement of the *status quo;* but, as I shall endeavor to explain, it is not the fundamental cause; other circumstances than the transparent pretext of renewed Dervish hostility are responsible for the altered situation. It is clear that Egypt has taken the first step in a policy which is vital to her, which is certain to tax her utmost resources, and may ultimately involve her in serious financial embarrassments. She is committed to the reconquest of her former territories, under the practical guarantee of Great Britain that any strategic posts recovered from the Mahdists shall be permanently held. The greater her military success, the larger will be the demands made upon her resources. Her scientific frontier at Wadi Halfa—and, in the opinion of military experts, it *was* a scientific frontier, easily defended—having been abolished, she has boldly advanced into the Soudan at a season of the year when military operations are necessarily conducted under the least favorable conditions, and with the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

avowed intention of penetrating as far south as the opposition offered by the Khalifa shall determine, or, to quote another official version, until her surplus funds are exhausted. The present objective is Dongola; but that, admittedly, is only the first step towards Khartoum.

Great Britain, and not Egypt, is morally responsible for this forward movement, although the military operations are nominally conducted under the Egyptian flag. The *bona fides* of the protectoral power is scarcely questioned, except perhaps by France and Russia, and it is honorably established by the fact that, until the Soudanese provinces are recovered, the task of Great Britain in Egypt will remain incomplete.

Her Majesty's government were directly responsible for the evacuation of the Soudan, which had fallen into a state of anarchy in consequence of Egyptian misrule. The popular rising known as the Mahdist revolt eventually drove Egypt from the Upper Nile and established a bandit hierarchy in her place. The sanctuary of the Mahdists, which formerly was a source of illicit profit to individual slave-traders and Egyptian Pashas, though always a drain on the Cairo exchequer (except for a brief period under Gordon's administration, when the Soudan cost Egypt nothing), has since represented a constant menace to Egypt, involving a considerable expenditure for military protection. But this outlay was reduced to a minimum by withdrawing behind the scientific frontier at Wadi Halfa and retaining Suakin. The desert regions thus opposed obstacles very difficult even for the Dervishes to overcome in delivering an attack in force upon bases well under the control of Egypt.

Egypt, being under the tutelage of Great Britain, the Dervish menace is partly directed against the protectoral state. This accounts for the military coöperation of Great Britain. Lower Egypt was originally occupied by British troops after the Arabi revolt, with the ostensible object of "restoring the authority of the Khedive." The army of occupation is merely the outward and visible sign of her intention to maintain by force, if necessary, the integrity and neutrality of Egypt; its withdrawal is contingent on the capacity and *bona fides* of the Egyptian government to maintain the *status quo*. Apart from forcible ejection, therefore, the contingencies inimical to the maintenance of British control over Egypt are—the renewal of hostili-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ties on the part of the Dervishes, the total collapse of the Mahdist movement and organization, the withdrawal of Italy from Eritrea, the military ascendancy of Abyssinia, or hostile enterprises on the part of European rivals.

In spite of the undoubted fact that the bloody tyranny of the Khalifa has alienated his followers and is becoming less and less potent for evil, so far as the security of the Egyptian frontier is concerned, the Dervish leader still claims the adherence of tribes which are unable of themselves, however willing, to resist his commands. But the evidence in our possession proves incontestably that even Egyptian rule would now be preferred by large numbers of so-called Dervishes (the Baggara Arabs chiefly excepted), if only they be assured, by the military success of Egypt guaranteeing the eventual re-occupation of the Soudan, that a change of mastership would protect them against their present oppressor. The renewed hostilities on the part of the Dervishes may, therefore, be regarded as a despairing bid for the support of all those subversive forces in the Soudan upon which their rule is based. They may have received some encouragement from the recent serious reverses inflicted by the Abyssinians upon the Italian expeditionary forces, and a certain amount of confidence from the general spirit of native turbulence and revolt at present prevailing throughout the greater part of Africa; but their adherence to a moribund cause, the fraud of which has been fully exposed, would receive its deathblow should Egypt succeed in recovering Dongola, Abu Hamed, and Berber, and in inflicting serious losses in the field. Khartoum would then lie open to a victorious Egyptian army.

The occupation of Uganda by Great Britain, the intrusion of military expeditions equipped by Great Britain, the Congo Independent State, and France, having the acquisition of the Upper Nile territories as their objective, and in particular the intrigues of France and Russia in Abyssinia, have profoundly affected the general situation. The net result is that political domination over the Upper Nile has become a question that can no longer be kept open by the unreclaimed (and, as some assert, the lapsed) rights of Egypt. Her Majesty's government have, therefore, decided, in the interests of Egypt, of which they are the trustees, to to take the first step towards the reconquest and pacification of the Soudan. Henceforth, any foreign power prejudicing those in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

terests by action that may be regarded as hostile, will be guilty of an unfriendly act.

The origin of the Nile expedition may thus be ascribed to a combination of the circumstances to which reference has been made; but its leading motive is, I contend, to anticipate the action of France and Russia on the Upper Nile and to check their combined opposition in Egypt proper. For it is not to be denied that, apart from that motive, the present moment is inopportune—or, at least, premature—for the initiation of a policy of such far-reaching consequences as the recovery of the Soudan for Egypt. The mere fact of a recrudescence of Dervish hostility or of the danger threatening Kassala cannot be urged as in itself necessitating an advance into the Soudan; for these have always been more or less permanent factors of the situation. Nor has the Dervish movement yet reached that stage when an advance to Dongola might be regarded as a mere *but de promenade militaire*. The Egyptian army, in spite of its remarkable efficiency, must depend largely upon British support for any extended operations in the Soudan; and, though at present the objective is strictly limited, it will inevitably be found necessary to secure other strategic positions before even Dongola may be held with safety. Sooner or later, British troops must go to the front; and, in the present state of international politics, that is a prospect which cannot be regarded with equanimity. For that reason, if for no other, Her Majesty's government would be open to censure for embarking upon a policy the issue of which cannot be foreseen, except under the assumption that our obligations to Egypt necessitated the acceptance of this risk.

The theory that *force majeure*, or ulterior considerations, and not merely the reasons assigned in Parliament for the advance to Dongola, precipitated the action of the British Cabinet, receives support from the actual course of events.

In his report for 1895, Lord Cromer refers to "the political tranquility which has prevailed in Egypt during the past year, and which stands in somewhat marked contrast to the general uneasiness of immediately antecedent periods." As regards military administration, he reports: "With the exception of a small raid on a village in the Wadi Halfa District, and an insignificant incursion into the Tokar Delta, the Dervish forces in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the immediate vicinity of the Egyptian advanced posts, although of considerable strength, have maintained a strictly defensive attitude." And he adds: "I fear that raids similar in character to those which took place last year (1895) must, from time to time, be expected." The situation was, therefore, normal at the end of 1895.

In the early part of 1896, three telegrams were despatched by Lord Cromer to Her Majesty's government. These telegrams, dated February 24, 26, and 28, announced the advance of Osman Digna into the Suakin District, having Kassala as the immediate objective, and reported threatened attacks by the Devishes upon Murat Wells (then garrisoned by an Egyptian force) and Kokreb, as well as the departure from Omdurman of reinforcements for Dongola. The British Consul at Suakin wrote in confirmation of these facts and stated that the Khalifa had proclaimed the *Jehad*, or holy war, against the Italians. It is thus clear that the Dervishes were preparing for an attack on Kassala and the Suakin District; but it is by no means evident that they contemplated any extraordinary raids upon Egypt proper.

On March 1, occurred the battle of Adua, by which the Italians suffered a serious reverse at the hands of the Abyssinians. On March 3, the Italian Minister of War ordered the abandonment of Adigrat and Kassala. On March 11, Her Majesty's government telegraphed to Lord Cromer ordering the advance of Egyptian troops to Dongola, in order to make a demonstration or diversion in favor of Italy, with the object of relieving the pressure upon Kassala.

The danger threatening Kassala caused great concern to Her Majesty's military advisers both at home and in Eyypt. The British Ambassador at Rome protested against the evacuation of Kassala, because, he argued, its fall would encourage the Dervishes and set free their forces for an attack upon the Egyptian positions. The Italian Minister of War therefore wired to General Baldissera: "If military conditions do not render the evacuation of Kassala necessary, the government desires that Kassala should continue to be occupied for political reasons!" General Baldissera, however, telegraphed (April 19): "What am I to do respecting Kassala? At present I have recalled Stevani with the greater portion of his forces." (Colonel Stevani was in command at Kassala). The Italian Minister of War at once replied (April

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

20): "Manage to maintain the occupation of Kassala until autumn; then we will see what is to be done, but if any grave military danger requires evacuation, the discretion to do so [carry it out] is left to you."

That is practically all the evidence, apart from ministerial statements, upon which we may base an opinion. It was in order to save Kassala, and incidentally to assist Italy, that the Dongola expedition was ordered. The menace to Egypt consisted in the investment of Kassala by the Dervishes, who were, it may here be mentioned, subsequently driven off. Had Kassala fallen, the Suakin District would have been threatened—as, for many years after its original evacuation by Egypt, it was threatened—by the Dervish occupation of a strong base. But, one may pertinently ask, if that alone were the menace, why did not Egypt offer to garrison Kassala itself (the route thence from the Red Sea littoral being open and safe) in accordance with the agreement between the Anglo-Egyptian authorities and Italy? That would have been the most simple and natural arrangement, and one that, according to present provisions, will undoubtedly be carried out in the autumn. It is true that the Dervishes were also threatening Murat Wells (between Korosko and Abu Hamed) and Kokreb (between Suakin and Berber), and that re-inforcements had been despatched to Dongola; but there was nothing in this situation—more or less a normal one—to warrant an advance in force beyond the scientific frontier, which has been easily held against far more serious menaces in the past. It is not until we come to examine ministerial statements that we discover the true objective of the expedition.

The Marquis of Salisbury, speaking in the House of Lords on June 12, was perfectly frank and explicit in his explanations to Lord Rosebery. Whilst admitting that the action of Her Majesty's government was largely due to friendship for Italy, and the necessity of saving Kassala, and that for many reasons an advance into the Soudan was inopportune at the present moment, he contended that "the interests of Egypt, in the first instance, and the interests of Italy, and *all that depends on the interests of Italy*, were affected by the result." He concluded by stating "that we shall not have restored Egypt to the position in which we received her, that we shall not have placed Egypt in that position of safety in which she deserves to stand, until the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Egyptian flag floats over Khartoum." But at the same time, he confessed: "In the present financial position, I am compelled to say that our object terminates at Dongola."

In the House of Commons, on March 21, Mr. Chamberlain contested the view that the situation was in any way altered. "The situation," he said, "was not altered. We shall be as ready afterwards—*at least, as we were before*—to consider any proposals leading to the eventual evacuation of Egypt; and we have never gone back from our pledges in that respect." I was in the House when this statement was made, and noted the saving clause, which was jerked in as an after-thought, in Mr. Chamberlain's inimitable style, and was received with derisive laughter. He went on to say that, as regarded evacuation, we had been too sanguine in the past. "That," he added, "was a mistake we were not likely to repeat." He complained that the action of France and Russia ("some of our allies") had retarded our work in Egypt; but congratulated Parliament on the support of the Triple Alliance. "As to France and Russia," he explained, "we wait"—a statement which was received with ironical cheers and counter cheers. Having emphasized the undoubted fact "that the control of the Nile was essential to the existence and security of Egypt," he concluded by saying: "The making of the railway (following the advance of the troops to Dongola) may, I think, be assumed to be a pledge that where we go we shall remain. We have no idea of handing back to barbarism such territory—be it more or less—as we may recover for civilization."

Mr. Balfour, on the same occasion, whilst traversing very much the same ground, also stated: "We mean to advance, and where we advance we mean to stay; and everything which is gained for Egypt by this expedition will, we believe, be gained forever."

Thus it is perfectly clear that the expedition to Dongola is the first step towards the reconquest and ultimate pacification of the Soudan. No less clear is it that the critical situation on the Red Sea littoral, following on the Italian reverse at Adua, precipitated an advance which, though always contemplated, Lord Salisbury regards as inexpedient, owing to existing financial, political and other reasons." It is, therefore, to the general political situation, and not to any imminent danger threatening

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Egyptian frontier, that we must look for an explanation of the policy of Her Majesty's government. That situation may be outlined as follows.

The collapse of the Italian military operations in Abyssinia threatened the ascendancy in that part of Africa of a powerful native state, under the moral protection of France and Russia, and encouraged a recrudescence of Dervish hostilities, by which the safety of Kassala was temporarily imperilled. For the last five years Russia and France have been intriguing in Abyssinia, with the object of establishing their influence over that country, and, during the recent hostilities, French agents were known to have supplied the Abyssinians with arms and ammunition that were used against Italy. France, moreover, opposed the demand of Italy to make use of the British base at Zeila for the purpose of executing a flank movement against the Shoan enemy, on the ground that such military action would have infringed the Anglo-French Convention regarding the neutrality of Harar. Had such a demonstration been carried out, with the consent of Great Britain (who was willing to grant Italy's request) and of France, the disaster at Adua might never have occurred. There is, in fact, sufficient evidence to prove that Italy owes her defeat in Abyssinia as much to the Franco-Russian collusion with her enemy as to the impotency of her efforts to impose a political ascendancy, which was indignantly repudiated by a virile and warlike population.

The danger threatening Kassala, having been averted by the defeat of the Dervish force investing this easily defended post, has now passed away. The Duke of Sermoneta instructed the Italian Ambassador in London (General Ferrero) to express his own and the Marquis of Rudini's warm thanks to Lord Salisbury for ordering the Anglo-Egyptian advance to Dongola, "*although,*" he added, "*of little military value to Italy*"; and Italy has consented to hold Kassala until the autumn "for political reasons." But the political conditions in the Eastern Soudan remain as they were. Italy has withdrawn behind the line of the Mareb, and has practically renounced her claims over Abyssinia, her chief stipulation in the terms of peace now being negotiated with Menelik being that no other European power shall be permitted to take her place. The result is that, if France and Russia were allowed a free hand, Egyptian interests on the Upper Nile would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be seriously threatened. This accounts for the open declaration of British ministers that the time has arrived, though in other respects it is premature, for Egypt to take the first step toward the recovery of the Soudan. It only partly justifies this extreme and hazardous measure. The other determining causes, to which brief reference has been made, are the activity of France in extending her sphere of influence on the Congo in the direction of the Upper Nile, and the cordial coöperation of Russia and France in questions concerning the Near East and the Far East. It is feared, and rightly, that, in return for French support, by which Russia has gained so largely in the Far East, the *entente cordiale* or alliance will be utilized for the purpose of undermining British control over Egypt. Signs are not wanting that active steps in that direction are pending. France has yet to receive her *quid pro quo*.

Thus, Great Britain has been forced to take action which, in the interests of Egypt, and especially of herself, might with advantage have been postponed until a more favorable opportunity had presented itself. There can now be no turning back, under the pledge of Her Majesty's government; and the consequence is that Egypt has been committed to the reconquest of the Soudan before she herself is in a position to undertake such a heavy task single-handed. No matter how slow the advance may be—and, owing to conditions well known to exist in the Soudan, it is impossible to regulate an advance that is to be *permanent* by the mere consideration of financial and military expediency—it must necessarily involve the support of British arms. Even in the initial stage it has been found necessary to garrison Suakin with British Indian troops, the cost of which, being partly imposed on India, plainly proves, by the confession of Her Majesty's government that this expedition has imperial objects incident on the maintenance of British control over Egypt. That it has been primarily undertaken in the interest of Egypt herself requires no direct proof, because, under existing conditions, the interests of Egypt and of Great Britain are identical in the Soudan. The ascendancy of any foreign power, other than Great Britain, within the basin of the Nile, would be a serious menace to the independence and integrity of Egypt, and, consequently, to British imperial interests.

The power of the Khalifa, even in the earlier days of his despotic rule, never seriously threatened Egypt proper, and was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

easily held in check; its expiring recrudescence at the present time cannot, therefore, be regarded as a menace to the frontier entailing an advance to Dongola. Besides, no secret is made of the intention of Egypt to advance as far as possible into the Soudan, even to Khartoum, with the object of recovering her lost provinces, finally and definitely. And in order to accomplish that object, in spite of the least conceivable resistance on the part of the Dervishes, the support of British troops and the aid of English money will be found necessary.

It is, in fact, quite obvious that the term of the British occupation must now be indefinitely extended. If the Khedivial government cannot rule Lower Egypt without the aid of a foreign power, it is certain she cannot hope to administer the Soudanese provinces. It is quite unnecessary to recall incidents and facts relating to Egypt's former administration in order to prove how utterly impotent she would be, under existing circumstances, to establish her rule on the Upper Nile. Financial considerations alone should deter her from this herculean task; because legitimate trade never at any time existed in the Soudan, and to introduce law and order under conditions of anarchy will be the work of years. Only Great Britain, with her Indian experience, trained administrators, and inexhaustible resources, can hope to do this. And if she should undertake it and succeed, what is to be her reward? When can she hope to retire from the Nile basin, with a protectorate of her own, Uganda, upon which she is prepared to spend large sums of money, absolutely depending upon the resources and closely affected by the political conditions of the Upper Nile? Is it not perfectly obvious that Great Britain will never—cannot, even if she would—retire now from the position which she has wilfully created for herself by the occupation of Uganda, Unyoro, etc., and by her action in Egypt, except under circumstances for which the past offers no prospect and has given no pledge? Her promise of ultimate evacuation is as sincere as such promises usually are, and may be repeated in good faith, but she cannot alter the conditions which render that evacuation impossible now and incredible to believe. No sane student of history and politics can imagine an Egypt capable of governing herself and of administering the Soudan, under pressure of international rivalries, and able to defend her integrity against foreign aggression.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For these reasons, France and Russia hope to gain by their action what they can scarcely hope to achieve by their diplomacy —a position of influence in the Nile basin by which the ambitious projects of Great Britain may be hampered. Time and advantage would have been in their favor; and these Her Majesty's government are not prepared to grant them. No other consideration, I contend, can be made to account for the initiation of the Nile campaign. Neither political expediency, apart from the motive assigned, nor ordinary military precautions for the protection of Egypt supply any adequate protest for a policy of such far-reaching consequences. France and Russia recognize this state of affairs; and thus it is that a new period of strife and struggle is dawning for Egypt, the issue of which will definitely determine the nature and extent of European domination over that country and the regions beyond.

ARTHUR SILVA WHITE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PAY OF COLLEGE WOMEN.

BY FRANCES M. ABBOTT.

THE woman problem and the industrial problem are subjects of paramount interest to this generation. When the two are interwoven the interest of the combined problem is equalled only by the ignorance concerning it. The Association of Collegiate Alumnæ, numbering nearly 2,000 women who have received college degrees, has just issued a valuable compendium of statistics on the "Compensation in Certain Occupations of Women Who have received College or Other Special Training." Like all the publications of the A. C. A., this pamphlet is distinguished by admirable thoroughness of compilation and fairness of statement. It is my purpose to put the facts into such form that they may be readily assimilated by the general mind.

Before beginning, I wish to warn my readers not to repose too much confidence in these statistics, carefully prepared though they be. Anyone who has ever conducted a written examination in school knows something of the variety of answers that a question can evoke from the human mind. When the minds are mature and highly trained, and the answer depends upon original thought and not upon a previously learned lesson, it seems as if the permutations were infinite. One might almost say that no inquiry ever strikes two people exactly alike. Again, as every collator knows to his sorrow, no matter how intelligent and responsible are the persons to whom a list of inquiries is sent, half of the forms will not be returned, and of the other half a goodly number will have the blanks imperfectly filled out. The marking system as commonly practised in school and college seems to me not less fatuous than the minute fractions of *per cent.* that are elaborately worked out of necessarily imperfect *data.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Having placed all statistical information in the limbo of uncertainty where it properly belongs, I wish expressly to say that the statements in this paper will have no value five years, possibly two years, hence, for woman's opportunities, and, moreover, industrial conditions in general are changing as rapidly as scientific inventions are being patented.

The object of the A. C. A. in its recent investigation was to find out why, and to what extent an inequality of wages is paid to men and women performing the same kind of work. Circulars were sent out to members of the A. C. A. engaged chiefly in professional, mercantile, or technical pursuits; but the pamphlet says that the inquiries were not in all cases restricted to alumnæ, but include in some instances women, not college-bred, engaged in occupations requiring special training. We are led to infer that the proportion of non-college women is small; but it is to be regretted that the exact figures have not been given, as it leads to confusion, both about the kind of work done by graduates and the compensation they receive.

The number of schedules returned in response to this investigation was 451. They represent all parts of the country—90 from New York, 61 from California, 59 from Massachusetts, 55 from Minnesota, 44 from Connecticut, 40 from Rhode Island, 39 from Indiana, 14 from Illinois, and the remainder (153) scattered among other States. The total number of occupations given is 66, but many of these are very nearly allied. There are 169 teachers, the largest number in any single employment, 47 librarians and women engaged in library work, 28 stenographers, 22 nurses and superintendents of nursing, 19 journalists, including editors and reporters, and 19 clerks without specification as to the kind of service. To show the variety of occupations represented, it may be mentioned that there is an actress, advertising agent, assistant in the National Herbarium, assistant on dictionary, assistant in observatory, astronomer, car recorder, draughtswoman, insurance broker, insurance solicitor, writer of advertisements, reviser of patents, water analyst, beside several proof-readers, telegraph operators, bookkeepers, and artists.

In looking over this list one is at once struck by the absence of physicians. This is probably due to the fact that this investigation does not consider independent workers, but only those employed by some firm or institution. The earnings of independ-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ent workers depend so much upon individual qualities that it is little use to try to classify them.

It may be mentioned in passing, however, that the profession of medicine is probably the most lucrative, as it is certainly one of the most useful and honorable in which women can engage. It has always been a matter of surprise to me that more college women have not undertaken it. Out of a total of 1,945 members in the last register of the A. C. A., but 35, or less than two per cent. write M. D. after their names. So far as I can learn, the woman physician in general practice in the smaller cities receives precisely the same fee as a man. In fact, the fee for an ordinary office or house visit is usually fixed by custom, and the young physician receives the same pay as the older one. The charges of specialists are graded by their reputation; and n the large cities all doctors' fees depend upon the quarter of the town they live in. The income of an established physician (male or female) in any of our cities of 15,000 or more inhabitants cannot be less than several thousand dollars yearly, and though the living expenses (house and horses) must be considerable, the physician can probably make a better financial showing than almost any other woman worker. The profession requires a long and expensive preparatory training, but one would suppose there are plenty of college women who would not be daunted by that.

To return to our tables, we find that 338 of the total number of respondents have some other remunerative occupation besides their main work; 74 have no other, while 39 make no answer. This seems rather surprising, especially as we immediately learn that in 350 cases (about 78 per cent. of the whole) the wages derived from the main occupation are sufficient for the support of the worker. It is further interesting to know that 117, or nearly 26 per cent., report that they are occupied with domestic cares besides their main work. The compilers note that this diversification of industrial pursuits seems to indicate that the burden of the woman is probably heavier than that of her male fellow-worker.

The table most interesting to the general reader is that relating to salaries. There is some surprise that these are given by the monthly instead of the yearly rate. The latter estimate is more intelligible, and also more accurate, because some occupations, mainly teaching, engage one's time for only nine months

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the year. In the absence of any information to the contrary, we may suppose that the teacher's yearly income is divided into twelve parts, in order to classify it with the salary of workers whose occupation continues all the year round.

By consulting the tables we find that 144 respondents, the largest number in any one class, are paid a salary between $50 and $75 a month, *i. e.*, from $600 to $900 a year. On either side of them we find two equal groups of 88 each. One of these groups receives between $25 and $50 a month ($300 to $600 a year) and the other receives between $75 and $100 a month ($900 to $1,200 a year). There are 73 who receive between $100 and $200 a month ($1,200 to $2,500 a year); two who are paid between $200 and $300 a month ($2,400 to $3,600 a year); and then comes the glorious news that two women receive over $300 a month ($3,600 a year).

This last fact ought to give a momentary gleam of happiness to every woman who reads these lines. There are two college women in this country whose services are adjudged by the firm or corporation which employs them as worth over $3,600 a year. One of these women is classed as a teacher (she may be a college president), and one as an insurance solicitor. Under cover of their brilliant record we can slip in the fact that six women acknowledge that they receive less than $25 a month ($300 a year). This is such a manifestly inadequate sum that we are forced to conclude that the whole time of the workers is not paid for, either because they are learning the business or because the business does not require many hours a day. These six workers are classified as follows: Three in library employment, one typesetter, one stenographer, and one assistant postmaster.

To recapitulate: There are 238 who receive less than $75 a month, and 165 who receive from $75 to $300 and over. Perhaps the profession of teaching deserves to be especially considered. Of the 161 teachers who reply to this question, 24 receive under $50 a month; 64 receive between $50 and $75; 42 receive between $75 and $100; 29 between $100 and $200; one between $200 and $300, and one over $300. There is but one other woman who receives between $200 and $300 a month, and she is an editor.

A salary of between $100 and $200 a month ought to support a single woman in comfort. Besides the 29 teachers there are 44

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other women who receive this amount. Nine are engaged in library work, four as editors or reporters, four as nurses or superintendents of nursing, four as clerks, three as stenographers, four as typesetters (is not this unexpected?), and one each as artist, assistant in the National Herbarium, assistant curator, assistant on dictionary, assistant postmaster, astronomer, bookkeeper, bookkeeper and cashier, examiner of bonds, manager, telegraph manager, stenographer and bookkeeper, stenographer and typewriter, combination stenography, teaching and newspaper work, typewriter, writer of advertisements, reviser of patents. While about 38 per cent. of the whole number of respondents are teachers, about 40 per cent. of those earning over $100 a month are teachers.

It is often asked why the majority of self-supporting, educated women continue to enter the profession of teaching. There seems to be good financial reason for it, notwithstanding the enormous competition. Other reasons are that a college graduate can undertake teaching without special training and that it offers large vacations, which are particularly acceptable to women. I have sometimes been told by teachers that the only redeeming feature of their work is the vacation, also that every day of it has to be utilized to get strength enough to go through with the next term. Still, a vacation gives a certain amount of independence. With past social conditions any woman engaging in active work has been almost obliged to forego social life during her period of work. The hours of labor are not those of society. Perhaps for this reason more than any other have cultivated women hesitated to undertake regular employment. They may have liked the work; they may have needed the money; but they were unwilling to sacrifice so much of what makes life worth living. There are signs of coming change. Club life seems to be reforming society along new lines. The constantly increasing army of working women of culture and social ability is compelling readjustments in our ways of thinking and forms of living.

The investigation asked one question, to which for some reason four-ninths of the respondents failed to reply. This is: How does the pay of men performing the same grade of work differ from yours? Of the 250 women who make reply, 150 get less pay than men for the same work, 95 receive the same pay, and 5 women actually receive more pay. The only comment we

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can make on this is that the facts are not nearly so bad as we had feared. The cheering information that five women receive more pay than men for the same work deserves analysis. One is employed in a bureau of charities, one is an editor or journalist, one is a proof-reader, and two are actually teachers!

It is often said that men should receive more pay than women because they have families to support. A teacher said to me some years ago that she did not believe there was a woman over thirty years of age earning her own living who did not have some one dependent upon her. She added: "These family obligations are not a matter of choice with women as with men. Men usually incur them by their own marriage; women find families thrust upon them through the marriage of some one else, perhaps of their own parents, years before they were born." Of the 379 women who answer this question about family support, 157 or about 41 per cent. aid in supporting others, while 222 or over 58 per cent. do not. The number of unhampered workers would seem to indicate that many young women, or women of well-to-do parents, are engaged in gainful occupations.

The committee of the A. C. A. were evidently determined to leave no side of the problem of woman's work unturned. It is sometimes alleged that women do not remain continuously in one employment or remain long enough to gain proficiency. There were 333 replies on this subject. Of the whole number of respondents, 214, nearly two-thirds, had followed but one kind of employment since beginning work. They had been at work on an average 7 years and 8 months. There were 88 who had two kinds of work in which they had been engaged 5 years and 4 months each; 19 had had three kinds of work for an average period of 4 years and 8 months; 9 had had four kinds; 2 had had five kinds, while 1 confesses to the extraordinary versatility which enabled her to perform eight kinds of work in succession for an average period of 7 months each. So far as this evidence is worth anything, it shows that the majority of women, when they have once chosen a vocation, stick to it.

In order to throw all the light possible on the reason for the inequality of male and female wages a number of employers were asked for their opinion. Replies were received from 104 employers, 25 from Massachusetts, 25 from California, 15 from Rhode Island, 14 from New York and the remainder from other

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States. In their establishments 7,794 persons were employed, 4,697 men and 3,097 women. It must be borne in mind that a large part of the female help could not have been college-women, though it is to be supposed that firms employing college-women were consulted whenever possible.

Of the 90 employers who replied to the question on the comparative value of the services of men and women, 46 said that they were equally valuable, 29 said the services of women were less valuable, 7 made indefinite replies, while 8 answered, "On some work, yes; on other work, no." If this is not all that could be hoped for, it is probably a better showing than could have been made ten years ago. When asked for the reason why women, in general, receive less pay than men for the same work, 67 replied as follows: 29 attribute it to the effect of supply and demand; 21 to physical and mental differences or difference in general ability, while 17 allege custom as an excuse.

I imagine that many of my readers, if they have had interest enough to follow my statements thus far, have done so for the sake of getting a definite answer to the question: Does it pay to send a girl to college? Many a well-to-do father, whose family is living comfortably and spending all he earns, and many a hard-worked mother, who wishes her daughter to have some easier and more remunerative occupation than herself, are anxiously pondering this question. After many years of investigation and observation I can give but an oracular answer. If pecuniary return be the chief motive for sending a girl to college, I should say the venture is as risky as any other business investment.

The necessary expenses at a woman's college are about $500 a year. The charges for board and tuition at Vassar and Wellesley are $400 a year; at Smith and Bryn Mawr, where there is greater variety in the accommodations, the average price is about the same. One hundred dollars is a reasonable sum for books, class and club dues, and necessary incidentals. Clothes and travelling expenses depend upon the individual. I have been told by a woman of wide experience, and my own observation confirms it, that a college woman is doing well if, upon graduation, she can obtain a place to teach for $500 a year without board. A teacher is obliged to dress decently, to live in a respectable quarter of the town, to attend an occasional concert, lecture, or play, and she

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ought not to be prohibited from buying books now and then, or taking a trip during vacation. She must manage well if she can do all this, even in a small city, on $500 a year. Of course, unless she is a young woman in comfortable circumstances, boarding at home, she hopes for speedy promotion; but it does not always come. I know of women who have taken advanced degrees at American and foreign universities (and this class is small enough to make its services valuable), who are filling subordinate positions in schools at less than $1,000 a year, and are unable to get any farther. Still, let us always remember that there are two women in this country who are paid a salary of over $300 a month.

It is becoming the fashion to send girls to college. The institutions are filled to overflowing, and at least three of them turn away hundreds of applicants every year for lack of room. A professor of chemistry at a woman's college, asking for enlarged laboratory facilities, said recently: "I am not begging this for myself. The pressure comes from outside. What can we do when well-prepared students insist upon coming?" There is scarcely a man's institution of any importance in the length and breadth of our land that does not admit the feminine mind, singly or in numbers, to some form of co-education, though in many instances the trustees are shy about acknowledging it.

The question, "Ought Woman to Learn the Alphabet?" which Thomas Wentworth Higginson discussed so wittily a quarter of a century ago, is happily settled, at least in this country. It has been proven that the majority of maidens take the baccalaureate degree without injury to health or manners. It has even been proven that a diploma is not necessarily a bar to their matrimonial prospects. Socially, a college woman is almost sure to have opportunities open to her, though sometimes she may be so overworked as to be unable to take advantage of them. For a rich girl a college training offers delightful possibilities. Howells says that we are getting to that state when our women are almost the only class left who have any use for what was once considered the education of a gentleman. Let us hope that some time, and the signs point that way, they may be thought worthy to receive the wages of the workingman.

FRANCES M. ABBOTT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEO-MALTHUSIANISM.

BY THE REV. R. F. CLARKE, S.J.

THE doctrines of Malthus respecting the growth of population, and its relation to the simultaneous increase in the means of subsistence, are now very generally discredited. His calculation that the population of a country doubles itself under normal circumstances in a quarter of a century, while the food for its support, instead of in any way keeping pace with it, advances only in accordance with the tardier laws of arithmetical progression, is not borne out by subsequent economists. The single precept which was the practical result of his investigations, "Abstain from marriage until you have sufficient means to support your family in comfort," is justly considered to introduce evils far worse than those which it was intended to remedy. It would have an injurious effect on the general morality and would tend to the degradation of a larger proportion of the female population.

But the difficulties arising from the rapid increase of population have not diminished since the days of Malthus. The decay of the warlike spirit, and the ever advancing appreciation of the blessings of peace, have removed, at least for a time, one of the chief agencies tending to keep down the number of human beings on the face of the earth. The improved sanitary condition of all civilized countries has been instrumental in bringing about an almost entire cessation of the fatal epidemics which decimated Europe during the middle ages. The wonderful discoveries of medical science have co-operated in various ways to the preservation of human life. The greater skill and knowledge of the modern leech has saved the lives of thousands who would otherwise have perished long before they had arrived at the term of years allotted to man by the Psalmist, and of tens of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thousands who in former times would never have seen the light, or have faded away in their infancy or early childhood. The death-rate of almost all civilized nations tends continually to become less, and that in spite of the feebler constitutions and earlier signs of decay that are the lot of the present generation.

We, therefore, have still to face the dangers of over-population. The crowding of the most active and enterprising of the country people into the large cities has aggravated the difficulties of the situation. It is true that the discovery of steam has told in the opposite direction. It has increased enormously the facilities for emigration, and has opened to the surplus population of an overcrowded country fields of labor that were quite inaccessible to them before. It has also made easy the transport of all the necessaries of life from the very ends of the earth, and the proletariat of London have a far better supply of cheap provision in the present day than they had half a century ago.

Yet there certainly exists a widely prevalent apprehension that a continuance of the present increase will some day either bring about a catastrophe, or entail a terrible amount of misery and degradation in the more thickly inhabited countries of the world. Men profess to discover, here and there, at least the first commencement of the impending evils; and they urge the adoption of some means, if any such can be found, of checking the rapidity of the increase. Malthusianism has failed, but a new school has arisen to whom we may give the name of "Neo-Malthusians," who while they reject the system proposed by Malthus, substitute for it a corresponding system of their own, which they think will avert the danger by surer and wiser means.

This new school does not desire to defer the period of marriage, as Malthus did. On the contrary, they rather encourage, within reasonable limits, the prevalence of early unions. They advocate the hindrance of a too rapid growth of the population, not by postponing conjugal felicity, but by a voluntary restriction on the part of married persons, of the number of children born to them. They recognize fully the evils attending any artificial bar to wedlock, but deny that the married state necessarily entails an unlimited offspring. They assert that ordinary prudence requires that we should not bring into the world those for whom we have not the means of providing, and they denounce, perhaps sometimes in rather unmeasured language, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cruelty and wickedness of deliberately disregarding the future well-being of our own flesh and blood, and of producing children who in the ordinary course of things are destined to either absolute or comparative pauperism.

If these reformers simply sought to enforce by their counsels such a separation between husband and wife as would ensure the end they have in view, if after the birth of just such a number of children as they believe they can bring up in their own station, they were henceforward to live as brother and sister, we should not have so much to say against their proposal. We could not approve of it. "Want of intercourse," says the great philosopher of antiquity, "has destroyed many a friendship," and this is more true of the friendship of married persons than of any other. A coldness and distance is apt to spring up between them. The wife ceases to be to her husband the "wife of his bosom." They are no longer of one heart and one soul, and become almost like strangers to each other. There is, moreover, the continual danger that one or other of them will seek a closer friendship elsewhere, and that passion will find unlawful indulgence in some forbidden way. The separation, moreover, is in a large majority of cases impracticable. It is only the upper class whose houses admit of its being effectually carried out. We may, therefore, put it aside as impossible for the masses, and undesirable in all but a few exceptional instances.

But this is not all that the Neo-Malthusians propose. They are no mere theorists, but practical men, bent on spreading their opinions far and wide. They do not ask husband and wife to live apart, but to live on as before, providing only certain preventive checks, which shall effectually put a stop to any further increase in their family, except in so far as they themselves may choose. They not only justify the adoption of such means in their own case, but recommend it to others. Already preventive checks are largely prevalent in France, and to this is in great measure due the stationary numbers of the population. In some parts of America Neo-Malthusianism is said to have made considerable progress, and to have been instrumental in the gradual diminution of many of the old families of the New England States, which stands out in striking contrast to the rapid growth of the immigrant portion of the inhabitants. In England such practises are on the increase, and seem likely

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to spread still more rapidly, on account of the zealous propagandism of many of their supporters, and the decay of religious belief among those who are called "orthodox Protestants." If the doctrines of the Neo-Malthusians are unlawful, and injurious to a country, it is full time that those who lament their prevalence should come forward to bear witness against them, and to show how ruinous are the consequences that will be their ultimate result.

Here we have to remember that those with whom we have to argue are not to be influenced by arguments based on religious dogma or on the pronouncements of authority. It is quite useless to tell them that what they advocate is opposed to the law of nature. Many of them do not recognize the existence of any *a priori* natural law, but say that what we know by that name is but a collection of generalizations from experience as to what is and what is not promotive of the general good. If you quote Holy Scripture against them, they will find a ready evasion in the special circumstances of the age, or perhaps will deny the binding character of the inference drawn from the Sacred Text. If you tell them that the means they propose are crimes which call down the anger of God, they will simply smile incredulously. If you appeal to their moral sense, they will assure you that it approves of their proceedings, and that a positive sense of guilt would arise in them if they were guilty of the reckless procreation of children whom they did not see their way to provide for. We must therefore take them on their own ground, and show that all religious and moral considerations apart, the practices they advocate are not only quite unnecessary to the well being of society, but absolutely ruinous to the welfare of mankind, most injurious to morality and productive of the very evils that they are intended to check.

We have then, first of all, to examine into the existence and causes of the evils to be remedied. The widely spread poverty and misery of our large cities, with all the social and moral degradation they entail, constitute, unhappily, a fact that no one can deny. But before we conclude that this is the result of the too rapid increase of the population, we must inquire of those who have the widest experience of the poorer classes, what are in general the causes of destitution among them. If we find that large families and wretched homes are invariably found

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

together, then the connection between the number of children and the ensuing misery or semi-starvation would be clearly established. Or if, again, those cities and districts where the numbers have increased the most rapidly, and where the inhabitants are most closely packed, are those which witness the greatest amount of suffering from extreme poverty, this, too, would indicate a connection of cause and effect between rapid growth and dense population on the one hand, and depressed economic conditions on the other. This is a matter in which we must look not to what the theorist tells us *must be* the case, but to what an examination of the facts tells us *is* the case.

I believe the experience of everyone who lives and has lived among the poor, whether it be Catholic priest or Protestant clergyman, Sister of Charity or district visitor, charity organization agent or Brother of St. Vincent de Paul, will bear me out in my conviction that nine-tenths, if not ninety-nine-hundredths, of the actual destitution among the poor is to be traced, directly or indirectly, to habits of drink. It is not, as a general rule, the drunkard himself who has to pay the heaviest penalty, at least in this world, for his intemperance. It is too often the helpless wife and the neglected children who have to bear the burden of their father's sin. There is scarcely a city or a town in the whole world from which all abject poverty would not practically disappear if the vice of drunkenness could be banished. Of course there are, besides, a number of instances of destitution in no way connected with drink. The sudden death or long illness of the breadwinner of the family will, from time to time, cause a very acute phase of misery and want. The poor helpless mother, with her hungry brood, is as sad a sight as well can be. But such cases are exceptional, and men do not legislate for exceptions. Such needs can easily be met, and are met in every well organized community, by Christian charity. They are also of their very nature only temporary. Even the poor widow left destitute with half a dozen little ones, if she is at all deserving, is sure to find friends and obtain employment. The pinch of poverty may be severe for a time, but in our complex civilization there is work for all who have willing hands and an honest heart. Add to this that the advance of habits of thrift, the increased facilities for insurance, and the growing sense of the duty of pro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

viding for such contingencies, make the occurrence of acute cases of unforeseen distress tend continually to diminish.

There is another point that is worth considering. Does a large family tend in the long run to greater poverty? It may for the first few years after marriage. But this is not, as a rule, the time when the pinch is felt. Both father and mother are in the prime of their health and strength, and the difficulty of finding sufficient means of support is, in the case of the industrious and sober, exceedingly rare. It is usually in later life that the pinch comes, if it comes at all. It is when middle age, or a life of hard labor, or some unforeseen sickness or accident, brings with it a lessened energy, and the need of more generous living. It is when the hair begins to grow gray, and the once upright form is bowed by advancing years, that hunger and poverty are most to be dreaded.

At this later stage of the career of the bread-winner of the family is the presence of a copious brood most often a help or a hindrance? I think that most of these who have had a practical experience of the life of the poor in our large towns and cities will agree with me that the contributions of the children, as time goes on, are in a large majority of instances a very material assistance to the comfort of its older members. When the big boys and girls are able to work in the shops or in the mills, the family income tends steadily to increase, within certain limits, with the increasing offspring. We often find families whose combined income is so large that they are able to enjoy not only all the necessaries, but also the comforts of life, and to form, besides, a little reserve fund if they are thrifty. Such families would be reckoned by tens of thousands in the large towns, both in America and England, if it were not that in too many cases the public-house, instead of the savings bank, is the inheritor of their surplus earnings, and robs them of all the comforts and a portion of the very necessities of life. But if the parents are temperate, and bring up their children well, the increasing numbers will, after a certain period, mean increasing resources just at the time when father and mother are beginning to be less able to fight their way amid the difficulties of life, and in the presence, it may be, of bodily infirmities.

This consideration is of still more telling force when old age overtakes the father and mother, and they look for some means

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of support in their declining years other than that provided by the cruel, comfortless shelter of the poor-house. It is easy to say that, with a limited family, they will have had opportunity of laying up some provision for the years when they can work no longer. This is beautiful in theory; but every practical man knows that, in point of fact, the number of the poor who can be induced to save is still comparatively small. Unless the state renders some insurance with a view to old age compulsory (and to this there are many objections), nine-tenths of the poor will be found, when their powers fail, without any pecuniary support for the concluding years of life. When this time shall arrive, they must look for help to one or other of their children. Their chance of being maintained in comfort will depend on their having one or more of their offspring able and willing to support them. In these circumstances, it stands to reason that the advantage will on the whole be distinctly on the side of those who have a numerous progeny. If a man has half a dozen children, there is a far better chance of one of them being the stay of his old age than if he has only two or three. The Neo-Malthusians would perhaps answer that the two or three would on their system be far better off than the members of the larger family of those who reject their teaching. Even if this were so, (and we are not sure that there would be much difference, or that the paucity of their numbers would be compensated by their superior resources), we fear that the principle of selfishness that underlies the Neo-Malthusian doctrines would not tend to any self-sacrifice on the part of the children for their parents' sake. But when an aged couple have some half-dozen sons and daughters, some at home and some abroad, some, it may be, married, and some still single, experience teaches us that in a majority of cases, there are found some one or more who count it a privilege to help their parents from far or near.

There is also another fallacy underlying the doctrines of the Neo-Malthusians. When they speak of the iniquity of bringing into the world children whom you have no reasonable prospect of supporting, they are using language which is applicable at most only to the poorest class in the community. Even among them, if the opinions I have expressed above are correct, the chance of bringing into the world little ones to starve is practically limited to those who, through their intemperance or sloth, themselves

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

create the very evil which these new doctrines pretend to meet. Was there ever, or, at all events, is there to be found now in any city on the face of the earth, any considerable number of individuals who, without any fault of their own, are unable to provide a sufficiency of food for their little ones? Putting aside certain accidental and transitory circumstances, the half-starved children have almost invariably a drunken, or else a hopelessly idle, father or mother. Surely it is not for these that the Neo-Malthusian would legislate. He knows well enough that the same causes that robbed the children of their bread would render nugatory any check on the numbers of their offspring, and that his sage advice will only take effect on those who are well able to supply to their families at least all the necessaries of life. Or if he answer that what he has in view is not so much to preclude the birth of children literally in danger of starvation, as to give to the offspring of a rather higher class a better start in life, and the opportunity of a more thorough education, he in no way improves his position. The danger of the present day does not lie in the direction of a neglect of the education of the children of parents of the artisan and the lower middle classes. More education is one of the panaceas of the modern reformer, and we have no cause to think that he will diminish in his zeal as time goes on. If, however, our Neo-Malthusian friends go further, and declare that it is the duty of every parent to make some pecuniary provision for his children, we do not believe that such a duty will ever be recognized by the common sense of mankind, or indeed that under ordinary circumstances it exists at all. How many have been ruined by the fact that they have never been compelled to rely on their own resources, and that they have had their path in life made smooth for them just at the time when the wholesome necessity of immediate exertion would have trained them to habits of industry for a lifetime?

I have said that in our complex civilization there is work for all who have willing hands and an honest heart. This proposition is one that will perhaps be disputed. We have heard a great deal of late of the "submerged tenth," and of the starving crowds who would fain work if there were work to do. This is a matter in which every man must speak from his own experience. After a life spent for the most part in London and other cities of England, where the labor market is supposed to be overglutted, I

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must confess that I do not believe that this is really the case. I am convinced that even in London there is room for every one. A man or woman who is not utterly incapable, or so hopelessly demoralized as to be unable to persevere in any sort of continuous occupation, need scarcely ever remain long unemployed. In the manufacturing towns of the north of England and of Scotland, there is often more work to be done than there are hands to do it. The children are set to work as half-timers as soon as the law permits of their employment, and the abundance of work is a temptation to parents to send their children to the mills when they ought to be at school. A family where there are a number of big boys and girls can earn a collective income that would keep them not only in comfort, but in luxury, if it were not for the curse of drink. Any one who knows the inner life of Manchester, St. Helens, Dundee, Glasgow, and many similar towns will tell you that there is plenty of money going in all of them, and that the poverty, hunger, dirt, disease, the ragged children, overcrowded houses, beggars in the streets, paupers in the workhouse, are to be traced, not to overpopulation, but (allowing for exceptional cases, such as we have noted above) almost invariably to drink. One of the most wonderful achievements of modern enterprise is the extraordinary cheapness of all the necessaries of life in the large cities of Great Britain. Bread, meat, vegetables, fruit, teas, sugar, butter (or its substitutes) are brought in abundance from the very ends of the earth, and are mostly far lower in price than when the numbers to be supplied with food were far less than they are now. While the rate of wages has steadily advanced; while the struggles between employers and employed has, in a large majority of instances, terminated in favor of the latter; all that is absolutely necessary for the physical well-being of the employed has, with the exception of house rent, come more within the reach of all than it ever was before. I speak, indeed, with some hesitation respecting the change that has taken place in American cities in this respect, because my knowledge of them is merely that of a passing visitor; but this at least I think I am safe in asserting, that in spite of the recent depression of trade, and the hardships it has entailed in many cities on the working class, the material advantages of European cities are far more plentiful across the Atlantic, that the wage rate is higher, the necessaries of life cheaper, and the facilities

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for finding employment far greater in Cincinnati, Pittsburg, Chicago, or even in New York itself, than they are in Glasgow, Manchester or London. If there is overpopulation anywhere, it is in Europe, not in America; if there are countries that are overcrowded, they are the countries of the Old World, not of the New.

What do we mean by overpopulation? I imagine that we mean that the number of inhabitants on every square mile is greater than what the country can support. If we examine the statistics of European population we find that the most crowded of European countries is Belgium. The average of inhabitants throughout the country is in Belgium 461 to the square mile, whereas it is in England and Wales 389, in France 181, and in Germany 205. If, therefore, overpopulation produces misery and want we ought to find in Belgium a maximum amount of these evils.

So far from this being the case, Belgium is one of the most happy, contented, and prosperous countries in the world. On the other hand, Ireland, which has lost half of its inhabitants in the course of the last fifty years, is the country where extreme poverty and destitution prevails, to an extent unknown elsewhere. It is true that the circumstances of Ireland are exceptional, but at least that country furnishes an answer to those who would have us believe that it is overcrowding which is at the root of all widely prevalent destitution, and that if we can only prevent a too rapid growth of mouths there will be more meat to put into them. The fact is that the facilities of transport are in the present day so enormously increased, that any labor market that happens to be overstocked soon pours its surplus into another that is not so well provided with hands to work it. The transfer may not be possible in a day or a week. Meanwhile, there may be a considerable amount of temporary distress. But the evil will soon remedy itself. President Walker, in a recent article, complains bitterly of the ever-increasing opportunities that are afforded to those who cannot find suitable employment in Europe for seeking a fresh home across the Atlantic! "The organization," he says, "of the European railway and steamship service is now such as to reduce almost to a minimum the energy, courage, intelligence, and pecuniary means required for immigration; a result which is tending to bring us no longer the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more alert and enterprising members of their respective communities, but rather the unlucky, the thriftless, the worthless." The bold proposal of General Booth to found a self-supporting colony beyond the sea, whither are to be gathered the surplus of the home population, the assisted passages to Australia and the Cape, and the rapid opening out of Africa, point to fresh fields for those who fail of a sufficiency of employment, or of an employment sufficiently remunerative to satisfy them, at home.

We must also bear in mind that almost every country in the world is becoming capable, year by year, of accommodating a larger number of inhabitants. Improved methods of agriculture, the utilization of sewage, the cultivation, and the profitable cultivation, of large tracts of land that were before considered hopeless, the draining of marshes, and the reclamation of land from the sea and from inland lakes, the possibility of obtaining a profit from the most sandy and unpromising soil, all enable mankind to be closer packed than formerly without fear of want. There is no reason to suppose that we have come to the end of these improvements, and if men threaten us with the terror of a population which multiplies faster than the means of subsistence can be multiplied, we answer by denying the supposed disproportion in the rate of increase, by reason not only of the ever improving productiveness of the soil, but also on account of the larger area under cultivation at home, to say nothing of the stream of cheap food that is continually flowing into our ports from abroad.

There is, however, a far more serious objection to the preventive checks proposed by the Neo-Malthusians. For they are not only unnecessary, but they would soon bring about a social degradation far more injurious than the exaggerated and somewhat imaginary dangers of overpopulation. I am not speaking now of evils which are regarded as such from a Christian point of view, but I allude simply to social and moral evils that would be considered such even by one who did not believe in a God or a future life. For the proposal of this new school is the adoption of some means which, without enforcing any sort of separation between husband and wife, would effectually prevent the birth of any more children, as soon as the parents decided that they had enough. The adoption of these preventive checks are regarded by the Neo-Malthusians not only as lawful, but as a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

duty to themselves and to their children, if they cannot look forward with sufficient certainty to being able to provide for their offspring in their own station in life. The neglect of this supposed duty they denounce as a crime. The following passage in an article by Mr. Ernest Bowden is a good example of Neo-Malthusian sentiments :

"When a parent who might decently rear a small family, calmly ignores the claims of his existing offspring, and so increases his family that, as often happens, one of his earlier children simply dies of poverty, how can he be logically acquitted of the barbarous manslaughter of his own child ? . . . Surely the more our heart is touched by the wail of distress from our fellow-creatures, the more keenly must we feel the downright wickedness of bringing a fresh human being into the world, if he have not at least a reasonable chance of leading a good and happy life."

Now let us suppose that this kind of teaching were to prevail, and consider what its consequences would be. It appeals to the educated class most of all, to those who are provident and who have a care for the future, to those who are capable of self-control, and have a keen sense of their duties to posterity. Such men will be the few and not the many. They will be men who have achieved for themselves and their families some sort of position, or who inherit resources which they feel bound to hand on in their integrity to their children. They will be (I am speaking from a Neo-Malthusian standpoint) the prudent, the temperate, the self-relying, the self-restrained. These will be the men who will have very small families and who will make it their object to prevent too rapid an increase of their race, as far as it lies in their power. And who, on the other hand, will be the class who in the halcyon days when Neo-Malthusianism is preached in public will be the reckless offenders against its teaching ? They will be those who are too careless and degraded to follow its precepts. They will be the vicious, the intemperate, those whose animal instincts are too strong to be subject to considerations of prudence. Will the drunkard take the advice of this new school ? Will those who are sunk in abject poverty, who are degraded and indifferent to all considerations, save the inclinations of the moment, pay any heed to these new teachers ? The Neo-Malthusian doctrines will simply fall on deaf ears, and will have no practical effect whatever.

What will follow, then, from the wider spread of this teaching, and from the conversion to it of all prudent and thoughtful

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

men? Why, simply this, that the higher type of the race will gradually die out, and the lower type will increase and mutiply all the more rapidly, by reason of the comparative fewness of those who otherwise would by reason of their superior nature form a powerful middle class, into which the lower type would make their way only in exceptional cases. The strength of a nation is not so much in its upper class, at least in the present day, as in an intelligent, energetic, honest, sober, industrious middle class. It is this which constitutes the strength of America, England, France, and Germany. The comparative absence of it is the weakness of Southern Europe, and also of South America. Anything that tends to increase the proletariat and to diminish the middle class, is a distinct injury to a nation. Anything that exalts this class into a less numerous but more wealthy upper-middle or upper class, is a distinct loss of strength and vigor. This would be especially the case when the very process of diminution involved the exercise of continual prudence and self-restraint, and the adoption of means which would only be attractive to those who were sufficiently endowed with the bump of caution to take measures against an evil which is always doubtful and generally far away.

Now this would be the infallible consequence of the prevalence of Neo-Malthusian doctrines. However widely spread, they would never be adopted into the daily life of the very class whom it is most important to diminish. The utterly careless and improvident, the intemperate, the reckless would increase as before; while the respectable and the far-seeing, the men who desired to make for themselves a good position, and to leave to their children a suitable provision would be those who would be anxious that their children should not be sufficiently numerous to hinder either their own comfort, or the future welfare of their offspring. Thus, if we suppose two families, one of which is limited by the parents to three children, while the other in the absence of any such limit has twice that number—if, moreover, the same rate of increase for similar reasons is maintained for six generations—the respective numbers, when the sixth generation is reached will be 729 on the one hand, and 46,656 on the other. If we suppose one-half of the more prolific race to have perished, on account of the greater rate of mortality in comparison with their more favored rivals, it would still leave the inferior type in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a majority of 30 to 1. In this way Neo-Malthusian doctrines are of a most retrograde character. So far from tending to the welfare of the human race, they tend to a steady deterioration of it. They would, in the natural course of things, bring us back to a class of plutocrats on the one hand, few in numbers, but possessed of superior natures and plenteous wealth, and on the other a continually augmenting class of the poor and the degraded with all the dangerous elements that follow from this class being sufficiently numerous to swamp those who belong to the nobler race.

This is not the only danger with which we are threatened if the doctrines of the Neo-Malthusians are to be generally accepted. They start with a denial of the binding character of what is termed the natural law, and say that the code which bears this name is but the result of a long series of generalizations from experience, which have for their object to discover what tends to promote the happiness and what the misery of the human race. In early days, they say, the rapid increase of the human race tended to the general happiness, and, therefore, what is called the natural law approved the procreation of a large family. Now, however, it is just the opposite. The rapid increase of the human family is most injurious to the general happiness, and, therefore, we assert that it is equally true that the natural law forbids it as that it once encouraged it. The natural law thus loses its absolute character and varies with varying circumstances. If this is to be granted, we must carry on the argument a little farther. In former times the natural law forbade the parent to destroy any of his children. There was plenty of room for all, and the selfishness of those who exposed, or took away the life of, the children they did not care to support was calculated to injure the common interests of the race. But now all this is changed. The curtailment of the family is (say the Neo-Malthusians) most desirable. Why, then, should the parent who has children whom he cannot bring up as he ought, be compelled to burden himself with them? Why should not he be allowed to dispose of those whom he has called into existence? Is it any kindness to bring them up with the almost certain prospect of misery and destitution before them? If man has a right over the laws of life, in that he can, by artificial means, prevent the accomplishment of what the law of nature declares to be the primary end of his own action, why should he not exert a similar sway over the life of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which he regards himself as the author? The danger of too wholesale an employment of this latter right is safeguarded against by the strong instinct of parental affection. But where this affection would display itself in the merciful cutting short of a life which threatens to be one of suffering and destitution, why punish the parent, if he refuses to prolong the life that can hardly fail to be doomed to a life-long misery? Take, for example, the case of a posthumous child born to some poor widow. She is herself starving. Already she has several little ones crying to her for bread and she has none to give them. Her new-born infant is puny and sickly and suffering. What is its prospect of a happy life? Why may she not add one drop more to the soothing draught she is giving it, and so induce, gently and without a pang, a peaceful sleep from which there shall be no awaking? If once we admit any exception to that absolute law within, which we call the natural law, surely such a case as this is one which justifies, and even renders praiseworthy, the action of the mother, who, out of love for her little one, forbids it to persevere in so unpromising an existence.

In other words, the consequence of Neo-Malthusian doctrines would be gradually to abolish the sanctity of human life, and to condone or rather to sanction and approve deliberate murder. Utilitarianism cuts at the root of every law of which we cannot perceive, with our dim and short sighted vision, the practical value. Once refuse to acknowledge as immutable and eternal the sanctions of nature's laws, and we shall soon find ourselves involved in a downward path leading to the dark abysses of pagan morality and pagan crime. Once turn away from the natural light that enlightens every man that comes into the world, and we soon find ourselves involved in the thick darkness that covered the earth when the code of heathen civilization had taken the place of the laws of God.

There is still another consequence that would follow from the course of conduct advocated by the new school. Around the purity of women God has placed certain safeguards. The consciousness of the disgrace that is likely to accompany any serious violation of the law of purity aids not a little to create even among those who are careless of the mere offense against God, a strong traditional instinct in favor of virtue. The knowledge of the consequences that may ensue, has, in point of fact, saved

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thousands from falling who otherwise would have fallen. The motive, it is true, was not a very exalted one, but it has often proved effectual where all higher motives failed. But—what is perhaps still more important—it has aided not a little in the formation of a potent and very healthy public opinion on the importance of maidenly integrity. The great difference that generally prevails between the appreciation of the value of purity to boys and girls, is a curious proof of this. There is no real distinction between the sin committed in the one case and the other; yet the world regards the indulgence of the passions as little more than a youthful foible in the young man, while in a young woman it is looked upon as an indelible disgrace.

Now, if this potent motive were to disappear, if sin could be committed without the immediate punishment which under present circumstances is liable to follow on it, if the terrible consequence of a fall were not present to the eyes of those whose frailty is at present only too prone to yield, and whose fear of God and hatred of sin is, alas! not sufficient to keep them to the paths of virtue, should we not have reason to fear a terrible increase of sexual license, and a gradual disappearance of that dread of sin which is to a great extent a healthy outcome of the fear of its consequences? We fear that already the poison of these new doctrines is spreading among the middle class both in Europe and America, and side by side with their wider circulation there is a continually diminishing love of purity, and a cynical depreciation of that jewel of innocence which even the heathen world regarded as a priceless treasure.

The conclusions then to which we find ourselves compelled to arrive are these:

1. The Neo-Malthusian doctrines would tend to produce the very evils that they are supposed to prevent, viz.: The growth of a large proletariat on the one side and the development side by side with it, of a small, but wealthy class of capitalists, continually diminishing in numbers as compared with the ignorant and undisciplined mass around them, but increasing rapidly in intelligence and material prosperity. This is a strange ideal for these new teachers to look forward to, but it is one that, according to their own showing, must certainly ensue.

2. There would gradually follow from the disregard and violation of what we call the natural law, other consequences, which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were common enough in pagan times, but are now universally condemned even by those who reject the teaching of Christianity, such as the exposure or murder of children whom it was inconvenient to the parents to maintain.

3. There would also go hand in hand with these new doctrines a steady depreciation of the importance of feminine purity, and a growing indulgence of the lower instincts, recklessly and without any fear of future consequences such as now prevails. These dangers are moreover to be incurred in order to meet an evil which is (speaking generally) not the result of overpopulation at all, but of other causes, of which the most fertile are drunkenness and laziness.

We cannot help suspecting, if the truth were known, that Neo-Malthusianism is but an excuse for selfishness after all. The pleasures of parentage are chiefly confined to the first two or three children. As life goes on the little stranger who makes its appearance from time to time is rather a burden than a delight to father and mother alike. All the fine talk of the duty we owe to our unborn children, or to children who ought to be unborn, is but a well disguised expression of a desire to be rid, as far as circumstances allow, of the hardships and self-sacrifice that a large family is wont to bring with it. If, by some impossible arrangement, a man himself were to be comfortably off in exact proportion to the number of his children, we should not hear much more of the duty that he owes to them, or the wickedness of bringing into existence those whose after lives may prove a burden to them.

I have argued this question on its own merits, quite apart from the claims of the natural law, or from any consideration of the fear of God. But I cannot conclude without reminding my readers that the practices advocated by the Neo-Malthusians are most serious offences against Nature and Nature's God. In the eyes of men those who are guilty of them may pass for honorable and virtuous citizens, but in the eyes of Him who sees in secret, the poor wanderer in the streets is far less culpable than those who thus set at naught, for the sake of their own comfort and enjoyment, the laws that God has laid down to regulate the increase of the human kind.

R. F. CLARKE, S. J.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE DUTY OF THE HOUR.

BY THE HON. WARNER MILLER AND THE HON. RICHARD P. BLAND.

I.

It seldom happens that differences existing between political parties are such as to raise the question of loyalty, on the part of either, to the fundamental principles of our government.

Parties usually divide on matters of administration, on revenue and method of producing it, on the powers of the general government and the rights of the several States.

But once in our history has any political party been disloyal, and then the majority of that party in the Northern States rallied to the support of the government, and gave invaluable aid in the contest for its preservation.

A government may be as certainly destroyed or revolutionized by peaceable methods through the ballot box as by war.

Our government is not paternal; it gives the largest amount of liberty to each individual consistent with the general welfare; it protects individuals in the exercise of political and religious liberty; it has made it easier for our citizens to acquire and hold property than under any other form of government; it protects the right of private contract among its people by constitutional provisions; it treats its citizens honestly and demands that they shall be honest with the government and with each other.

To protect the people against possible usurpation of power by either the legislative or the executive departments of the government it has provided a court of last resort, which shall judge of the acts of both of these departments and determine whether they are in conformity with the Constitution. This court is a most important part of our system.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Legislatures come and go, executives serve a fixed and limited term, but the Supreme Court, while changing its individual members, will continue in an unbroken line as long as the government shall exist. It is the real guardian of our rights and liberties as set forth in the Constitution.

All these principles of government are at issue in the present campaign. For the first time in our history a political party has openly proposed to debase and cheapen our currency; for the first time the right of private contract is condemned and laws are demanded to prevent it; in certain cases for the first time the Supreme Court is attacked and its re-organization threatened; for the first time the demand is made that private property shall be taken for public use without proper compensation.

The party which met in convention early in July, miscalled the Democratic party, threatens the country, if successful, with all of these evils.

The Populist party, which met in St. Louis a few days later, not only endorsed all that was done at Chicago, but went still farther in its attack upon our system of government as it has existed from the beginning, and pronounced against the preservation of law and order, and the safety of our property and people through the regularly established and heretofore unquestioned functions of our government.

Mr. Bryan was nominated for the presidency at both of these conventions. It has been said that he secured the nomination at Chicago by his oratory, but this is a mistake; that convention was dominated absolutely by the Populistic sentiment which had gained control of the organization of the Democratic party, and it nominated Mr. Bryan because he was a Populist and not a Democrat of the old school. The Populist Convention at St. Louis nominated him because he was the real leader of their party, and more than any other man represented their theories of government. If any proof is needed of this statement let his speeches in Congress, his speeches on the stump in his own State, and his editorial writings furnish the evidence.

The Populist Convention failed to endorse as its candidate for Vice-President Mr. Sewall, who had been put in nomination at Chicago, because he was not a Populist, or at least had up to that time never given any evidence of his being a believer in their doctrines.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Opposed to this candidate and to his Populistic principles we have William McKinley, nominated at a Republican Convention held in St. Louis early in June. The history of the Republican party from its organization down to the present time is a sufficient guarantee of its continued loyalty to the principles of our Constitution, but in this emergency it has spoken upon all of these questions with no uncertain sound.

The candidate himself has made a record during his long years of public service which is a sufficient pledge that the principles of his party, as laid down in the platform adopted at St. Louis, will be honestly and fearlessly carried out in his administration, and in public speech since his nomination he has given pledges of his support of the platform.

The proposition to debase and cheapen our money is found in the demand of the Populists for the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. The avowed object of this is to scale down all the debts both national and private 50 per cent.

In the war for the preservation of the Union we contracted a national debt of nearly three thousand millions of dollars; we borrowed this money upon the best terms that we could, the rate depending from day to day upon the success or defeat of the Union armies, and the faith of the world as to our success.

We pledged the world that we would pay our debt in the honest money of the world. When the war closed some faint-hearted and dishonest people advised the repudiation of the entire debt; others quite as dishonest at heart, but not so bold in statement, demanded that the debt should be paid in greenbacks or fiat money; but the loyal men of our country vastly outnumbered the dishonest cowards, and we have gone on paying our debt and interest in gold or its equivalent, until to-day less than one-third of the debt remains to be liquidated.

After this record for honesty and fair dealing shall we scale down the remainder of the debt to 50 cents on the dollar, and thus forever tarnish and blacken our record as a people?

The Populist platform demands that the government shall be permitted to liquidate this debt in a depreciated currency. We still owe a great debt to the soldiers of the late war in the form of pensions. Shall we scale down that debt also to 50 cents on the dollar? That is what the Populists demand. Or shall we continue

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to pay these pensions in the same money with which we have paid our bonds and the interest ?

The Republican party in its platform and Mr. McKinley in his public speeches have declared against the free coinage of silver and for the maintenance of currency upon a parity with gold.

This silver question reduces itself to a simple matter of common honesty between the government and its people and between private individuals.

If an individual fails in business, and is not able to pay his debts in full he may make a compromise with his creditors, if they are willing to accept it, of fifty cents on the dollar, or for any other amount that may be mutually agreed upon ; but this is a proposition to make such a compromise by the force of law.

Those who are in favor of that course will support the Populists and Mr. Bryan, but those who are in favor of honesty cannot do otherwise than support Mr. McKinley for President.

The proposition of Mr. Bryan for the free coinage of silver or the making of a fifty-cent dollar is only half the truth of what he and his followers propose.

Mr. Bryan as a member of Congress recommended the issuing of fiat money by the government upon the ground that the people would save, first, the interest upon the money, and, secondly, if the money was not redeemed that they would save the principal also ; and the Populist Convention at St. Louis demanded that the general government should issue fiat money ; it should be full legal tender for all debts both public and private, and that "efficient means should be furnished for its distribution direct to the people." This is nothing more nor less than repudiation of all the debts of the government.

The payment of the debts of the government by the issuing of fiat money, without provision for its redemption in coin, is simple robbery under the forms of law. Can there be any question as to where our loyal citizens would stand upon such a proposition ? There should be none, and I do not believe there is.

The attack upon the integrity of the Supreme Court is even more dangerous than the attack upon the currency.

This court is removed from the influence of partisan strife as absolutely as any body of men can be. It has always held the respect and confidence of the people ; and its decisions have been received and obeyed as the supreme law of the land.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The attack upon it is based upon two acts—the declaration of the late income tax law as unconstitutional and the use of the court for the suppression of a great riot known as the "Debs Riot."

The action of the United States Court in the matter of the Debs Riot has been condemned by every Anarchist, every Socialist, every Communist, and every Populist in the country.

What are the facts?

A great riot took place in Chicago; the United States mails were stopped and all inter-State commerce passing through that great city was suspended; the Governor of the State refused to do his duty because he was in sympathy with the rioters; the Mayor of the city failed to do his duty for the same reason; the federal government was appealed to to protect the carrying of the mails and to enable inter-State commerce to be carried on without interruption.

The court, through the proper exercise of its powers, forbade all persons from interfering with the movement of the mails and with commerce, and when the rioters failed to obey that order, the President of the United States, exercising his just powers under the Constitution, ordered out the army of the United States, suppressed the riot, arrested the leaders, moved the mails, and set the wheels of inter-State commerce in motion.

Had this not been done the riot would have succeeded; it would doubtless have grown into a civil war; it would have destroyed Chicago and untold millions of property of the citizens of the United States, and doubtless thousands of lives would have been sacrificed.

In suppressing this riot and demonstrating the power of the federal government to protect its own people and their rights President Cleveland performed an act which, in my judgment, will, in the centuries to come, do more for the preservation and maintenance of our institutions than any single act of any President since the close of the late Civil War.

As the population of this country increases, its discordant elements, the Anarchists and the Socialists of the old world, will doubtless come here in larger numbers than ever before, and under our free system of public discussion and public agitation they will attempt more and more to spread their doctrines among our people; then this power of the federal government to protect itself,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its citizens, and its functions will of necessity be called into action, and the course followed by President Cleveland at Chicago will be a sufficient precedent for all future administrations.

Can any patriotic American citizen hesitate as to whether he shall give his suffrage to the man who stands for the defence of our liberties through the Supreme Court, or whether he shall give his suffrage to the man who condemns the Supreme Court and upholds the right of riot and civil discord?

In both the platforms, the one adopted at Chicago and the one adopted by the Populists at St. Louis, the right of private contract is attacked and a demand made that laws shall be passed limiting it. This right has always been sustained by our courts; it is a right of the very highest importance to the private citizen, and should be maintained at any cost or sacrifice.

McKinley stands for the inviolability of contracts; Bryan stands for all that is opposed to that principle.

The Populists demand that the government shall take and operate our railroads; if the government takes the railroads it must exercise the right of eminent domain.

The Constitution provides that private property shall not be taken for public use except by just compensation to the owner.

The value of our railroads is a vast sum—some three or four times more than the entire national debt at the close of the war.

They are owned, not by a few people; but hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of our people are interested in the stock and bonds of these corporations. The government cannot pay for them in money, unless it creates fiat money and compels the present owners of these railroads to take it.

If it issues bonds it cannot compel the owners of the railroad securities to exchange them for the government bonds; it must put its bonds upon the market and sell them to the highest bidder and pay for the railroads with the money thus secured. No one having knowledge of finance believes for a moment that this can be done. There remains no way by which the government can take these railroads except by confiscation and by compelling the present owners to accept fiat money for the securities which they now hold.

When we speak of this as a dishonest transaction we use mild terms; it is simply robbery committed by the power of a great government which no private citizen is able to resist.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The theories of the Populists are only partially discussed in their platform. Associated with them are all the discordant, dissatisfied elements in society; the Anarchist naturally turns to that party, and the Socialist and Communist also naturally turn to it. No one is far-sighted enough to properly describe what would be the condition of society if all the powers and functions of this great government were given into their hands. It certainly would produce a revolution in our government through the ordinary forms of law, which would leave not one of the principles established by our fathers, and confirmed again and again through the laws of Congress and the decisions of the Supreme Court.

If we believe, then, that this government is the best the world has ever known thus far; if we believe that our liberties, lives, and property are safe under it, we must of necessity, laying aside all partisanship, give our support to the candidate who by his life and public acts, and by the declarations of his party, which he has adopted, gives us an absolute guarantee that in his hands and under his administration the honor and integrity of the country will be safe, and that the rights and liberties of our private citizens will be maintained.

WARNER MILLER.

II.

THERE are many reasons why Mr. Bryan should be elected, and why the Democratic platform should be enforced as the policy of this government. His election would mean a complete change in the legislation and administration of affairs. The policies of the government would be taken from the old ruts and re-established upon pure Democratic lines. It would mean the displacement of the classes who have heretofore controlled legislation and the establishment of the principle of the greatest good for the greatest number.

It is charged that the Democratic platform is dishonest; that the aims and purposes of the party that proclaimed this platform and nominated the candidates upon it are dishonest and revolutionary. But, in reviewing the political situation and the condition of the two parties, the people may judge as to the facts relative to the matter of dishonesty and revolution. On the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one hand, it was gravely charged and asserted by a distinguished United States Senator, Mr. Chandler, that the manager of Mr. McKinley, Mark Hanna, had extorted, or endeavored to extort, from certain classes of our people, a quarter of a million of dollars, to be expended as a fund to secure the nomination of Mr. McKinley at St. Louis. That grave complaints were made by the friends of other Republican candidates for the presidential nomination against Mr. Hanna, on the same ground, is a matter of political history that cannot be disputed. And since the nomination of Mr. McKinley, the Chairman of the Republican National Committee, Mr. Hanna, has proclaimed his committees appointed for the purpose of raising a campaign fund to secure the election of the Republican nominee. The men in New York who constitute this campaign fund committee represent an aggregate wealth of over $500,000,000. The men in Chicago representing this campaign committee, or the committee to raise funds for the campaign, represent an aggregate wealth of over $100,000,000. Among the persons designated as members of this committee may be found men known to be the heads of trusts, combines, and monopolies, and who have amassed enormous wealth by the advantages they have gained in legislation, not only in the federal government, but in the various State governments and municipalities in which they are located.

As a further evidence of the classes who are behind and giving force and effect to the Republican campaign, it may be stated that at the Madison Square Garden meeting, the other night, at which Mr. Bourke Cockran spoke, there were vice-presidents on the platform with the speaker claiming to be Democrats, but who were cheering all the while for Mr. McKinley, who are publicly known to be at the head of many trusts and combinations against which Congress has fulminated its laws, and which laws have heretofore been a dead letter upon the statute books.

Who are the parties leading the Democracy in this campaign? The public will not fail to note the fact that some of the men who have bolted the Chicago platform and the nominees are notoriously the beneficiaries of trusts, including the Standard Oil Trust, and many others of less importance that may be named. Indeed, the Chicago platform and nominees are a standing menace to combinations, to monopolies, and the favored few

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who have enriched themselves at the expense of the masses of the American people. On the platform with Mr. Cockran, and on the committee to raise funds for McKinley, may be noted the men and the syndicates, and their sympathizers, who in one bond issue alone robbed the people of this country of over $10,000,000. And on these committees to raise campaign funds may be noted the men who have taken control of the beef market of this country and dominate the prices to be paid to producers of cattle, as well as to the consumers of beef—the men who have sturdily resisted the demands of labor for fair wages, and who have used all their power to crush labor organizations and to degrade the common people of this country.

That the Republican party represents all the trusts, combinations, and other systems of class legislation and robbery that have existed in this country for a quarter of a century is a matter of political history that no man can deny. When we see the men who are the beneficiaries of class legislation and monopoly, without regard to party, whether Democrats or Republicans—the men who have heretofore claimed to be Democrats—all combining to fight the Democratic platform and the Democratic nominees, it is an object lesson that the American people will not fail to observe and to be governed by. Therefore, as I stated in the beginning, the election of Mr. Bryan would mean the displacement of these favored classes, their dethronement from control and domination of public affairs, and the re-establishment of our government upon the principles of Jefferson and Jackson and Lincoln, as a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," instead of, as it has existed in recent years, a government of the classes, by the classes, and for the classes. The idea of the beneficiaries of the bond issues for the past few years, who have squeezed the government and robbed the people of millions of dollars, setting themselves up as tutors and exemplars of honesty, in politics or anything else, is a spectacle for gods and men. And yet it was to this class and this element that the Hon. Bourke Cockran, in his celebrated speech at Madison Square Garden, in pretended answer to Mr. Bryan, appealed, because they constituted his audience in the main, and were the promoters of his enterprise.

The American people are beginning to understand that this movement for the election of Mr. Bryan, on the principles of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Chicago platform, means the restoration of this government to the hands of the plain people of this country; and hence the war now being made upon this movement by the beneficiaries of class legislation. It is true that the currency question is the dominant issue in this campaign. But it is also true that, aside from this question, the people believe that the election of Mr. Bryan means more than simply the restoration of silver, or the reformation of our currency. It means a complete, radical, and absolute change in the policies of administration, as I have stated.

What would be accomplished by the election of Mr. McKinley? Merely the continuation of existing conditions which have prevailed for many years past under Republican rule, as well as under the policies of the present administration. All parties insist that our present financial condition is deplorable; all admit that the present condition of our country is unsatisfactory to the people. They insist that there should be a change, a radical change, in the present depressed condition of our industrial population. Should Mr. McKinley be elected, he is pledged by the St. Louis platform to maintain the single gold standard. The policy of the Republican party is boldly declared to be for the maintenance of the single gold standard, at all hazards. How is this standard to be maintained? We know that during Mr. Cleveland's administration, in order to carry out the policy inaugurated by the Republican party, and maintained by the present administration, upon the financial question, there has been saddled upon the people of this country a bonded debt of $262,000,000. We are constantly driven to the necessity of borrowing money from Europe, in order to maintain for us the same monetary policy as prevails in Europe. Will Mr. McKinley continue the issue of bonds; and if not, what will be his policy upon this subject? It is true that, pending the campaign, the representatives of the bond syndicates of Europe and this country, whether they call themselves Democrats or Republicans, for political purposes, have ceased their raids upon the Treasury, and now pretend to be engaged in the patriotic work of maintaining the gold reserve so as to prevent the exporting of gold to Europe. But no one doubts that, like Bob Acres's courage, this "patriotism" will "ooze out" the moment Mr. McKinley is elected, and their raids upon the Treasury gold will be renewed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with great vigor in the fall. What will Mr. McKinley do to procure the gold to meet these demands? His party has denounced the administration of Mr. Cleveland for the issuance of bonds, and especially because they declared that the policy of his administration had been such as to prevent revenues from getting into the Federal Treasury, to meet the demands of these gold raiders in Europe and the United States. The American people want to know, and it is an interesting question to propound to Mr. McKinley and the Republican party: How are you going to procure the gold to meet what the gold gamblers of this country declare to be "gold demands"—that is, our greenbacks and Treasury notes? It will not do to answer this question, as it has been attempted to be answered by some of the Republicans, that taxes will be raised to such a point as to secure a surplus fund in the Treasury to meet these demands. Our present tariff is within the lines of protection. If it is raised higher, it will probably exclude revenue instead of raising revenue. Our Republican friends will hardly go before the country insisting that they will put the tariff on a purely revenue basis, in order to secure greater revenue to the federal Treasury; and unless they do that, there is no possibility of any tariff legislation increasing our revenues.

But, aside from the question as to whether our taxes are to be increased or not, another matter to be considered is: In what sort of funds or money shall taxes be paid? We have no taxes to-day paid in gold, and gold only. Our customs' taxes may be paid in silver dollars, or silver certificates, and are, under the ruling of the Treasury department, payable in Treasury notes and greenbacks. Our internal revenue taxes may be paid in any forms of our money or currency; so that, as a matter of fact, there is no possibility of exacting from the taxpayers a single dollar in gold to be put into the Federal Treasury under our present system of taxation. No gold can be procured, by way of taxation, to meet the "gold demands," unless taxes are made payable specifically in gold and gold alone. Do our Republican friends intend to resort to such a drastic mode of taxation as this? If not, will they tell us how they propose to procure the gold, by way of taxation, to maintain the gold reserve? There is but one other way in which to maintain the reserve, and that is the method followed by Mr. Cleveland's administration—to wit, the sale of bonds from time to time for gold. But this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

system the American people has condemned. There is another way by which it has been proposed to maintain the gold standard, that is to say, by the retirement of the greenbacks and Treasury notes, amounting to somewhere near $500,000,000. But even this would probably fail, and the next demand would be to retire all full legal-tender silver money, and to make gold, and gold only, the sole legal tender in this country, and bank notes the only currency to supplement gold.

Mr. Cleveland insisted that the treasury notes and greenbacks should be refunded into bonds, or the bonds sold for the purpose of redeeming and cancelling these paper issues, but the Congress of the United States refused to conform to these recommendations. Will the Republican party undertake to retire Treasury notes and greenbacks, and thus take from circulation what Mr. Sherman and Mr. Carlisle have both denominated "gold demands"? The natural way to maintain the gold reserve would be the retirement of all paper issues redeemable in gold, for this would so contract the currency of this country as to reduce prices below the level of prices of the world, and thus induce a flow of gold to this country to buy property and commodities, because they could be bought cheaper here than elsewhere. In other words, by still lowering our prices, we could make gold more valuable here than elsewhere. The difficulty of entering upon such a policy, however, is that the American people would rebel against it. They would not long maintain in power a political party that had entered upon so drastic a course. So that we can see no relief whatever to come to the people of this country by the election of Mr. McKinley.

But, even if the Republican party should undertake to carry out any of the policies indicated, it would be powerless to do so. Mr. McKinley's election would not mean that he could secure the passage of any tariff bill, nor could he secure any legislation upon the currency question, for the simple reason that the Senate, as now constituted, and as it will remain constituted, will be a barrier to any policy foreshadowed in the St. Louis platform. The country well knows that the Republican tariff bill, passed by the Republican House of Representatives in the last session of Congress, was defeated in the Senate by Republican votes; and the people know that no tariff bill, that no bill for the issue of bonds, and no bill upon the lines laid down in the St. Louis platform,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could pass the Senate during Mr. McKinley's administration if he were elected. He would be utterly helpless as President, and would simply find himself occupying the same position Mr. Cleveland has occupied during his present administration. There would be nothing left for Mr. McKinley but to pursue the policy followed by Mr. Cleveland—to wit, the issuing of bonds from time to time to procure gold with which to maintain the gold standard. And the very men who are now, for political effect, refraining from drawing gold from the Federal Treasury, in order to secure the election of Mr. McKinley, would be the first to rob the Treasury of its gold the moment it ascertained the Republicans had been victorious in the November election. Yet these are the men who denounce the Democratic platform for dishonesty.

The question then arises, Are we to have, and ought we to have, a change from the present conditions? Are the people satisfied with the hard times now in this country? Are they prepared to say that they would prefer the continuation of the present administration, or of an administration that would pursue the same policy as that of Mr. Cleveland, or do they desire a change? If they wish a change, there is but one method in which to secure it. That mode is pointed out in the Democratic platform adopted at Chicago.

We propose to base our system of finances upon the well-tried doctrine of bimetallism. We declare that our bonded debt, that the greenback and Treasury notes, and all other forms of government paper payable in coin, are payable in gold or silver, at the option of the government, and not at the option or pleasure of those holding government obligations. We insist that this government is strong enough to pursue the policy that is followed to-day by the Bank of France, which is, to pay gold or silver at the option of the Treasury and thus to bring silver into use as an aid to gold, and in this way to obviate the necessity of any further bond issues to maintain coin redemptions. And as a means of supplying our people with a currency we propose to go back to the old system that was followed by this government during eighty years of Democratic rule, with open mints to the free coinage of gold and silver, as was our policy prior to 1873. This will give us a system of currency that will be adequate in volume, and stable, as compared to all other things. This we propose to do without the aid or consent of any other nation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We insist that this country is abundantly able to maintain a financial system of its own. The Republican party, in its St. Louis platform, confesses that bimetallism is preferable to gold monometallism, but demands the maintenance of the gold standard until international agreement can be had looking to the establishment of bimetallism throughout the world. The people of the United States have become impatient upon the question of international bimetallism. For more than twenty years the argument of international bimetallism has loomed up to thwart the hopes of the American people upon this subject. It has been interjected into every campaign and been made a stumbling block to every step looking towards the restoration of silver by the American people. They will no longer be fooled in this way. We must either establish bimetallism for ourselves or surrender the fight and content ourselves with the single gold standard for all time.

The people of the United States, while not so large in population as are France and Germany and Great Britain combined, yet constitute nearly 75,000,000 people, with productive power as great as all three of the nations named. We have a commercial power equal to theirs. And besides all this, we are a nation comparatively new, with an immense territory yet to be developed, and with enterprises to be entered upon far exceeding the resources of all Europe combined.

In other words, if the nations of Europe combined could maintain a bimetallic standard, the United States can do so alone; for our commercial power and our needs for money are as great as those of the principal countries of Europe combined. The demands of this country for silver would equal or exceed the demands for silver as money, by France, England, and Germany together; and yet in the face of this fact, well known by sensible people, the advocates of the single gold standard insist that under the free coinage of silver favored by the Chicago platform, the demand for silver by the people of this country would not cause its value to appreciate, as compared with gold. No man in his senses but can see that should our government cease its great demand for gold, which now exists under the single gold standard, and throw its power upon the side of silver, making its demand for silver instead of gold, such a condition would inevitably lower the value of gold and appreciate that of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

silver, thus bringing the two metals to practical parity in this country, and throughout the world. Whatever value we should give to silver at our mints, that metal would obtain the world over. No matter where silver might be, it would there command the same price it would have in the United States, less the cost of transportation; for no man would take less for his silver, anywhere in the world, than he could procure for it at our mints. And hence, instead of silver coming here to be coined, as is insisted by the advocates of the single gold standard, silver would perform monetary duty throughout the world, at the value fixed upon it by our mints. It would remain in the various countries where needed, and pass at the monetary value fixed in the United States.

Under a system of bimetallism there would be no difficulty whatever of maintaining all forms of our currency at par with coin. There would be no necessity for contracting our currency, or destroying the greenbacks or Treasury notes. They would circulate everywhere as the representatives of coin, and of equal value with coin.

Under such a system of currency there would be a revival of business throughout the land, that would cause money to flow into our Treasury in amounts sufficient to meet all demands. Under our system of taxation on consumption, taxation may decrease as consumption decreases under stress of hard times and scarcity of work. A revival of business activities would necessarily largely increase consumption, and this increased consumption would swell the money flowing into the Treasury.

There would be no scramble for gold, for silver would answer all the purposes of gold.

The stock of silver coin and bullion now in the Treasury, together with the coin that would come into the Treasury by way of taxation, would at all times be sufficient to meet our coin obligations, thus obviating the necessity for continued sales of bonds for resumption purposes.

R. P. BLAND.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

STAGE SCENERY AND THE VITASCOPE.

WHEN Mr. Edison first made his kinetoscope, and long before it was put generally on public exhibition, he foretold that he would enlarge the effects produced by it, and give life-sized pictures of people, all sorts of animals and mechanisms or other objects in action, with every detail of their movement and every expression of their faces. These "living pictures" in a new sense—these illuminated shadows that have all the naturalness—and a nearly perfect semblance, of reality—could, he said, be used in conjunction with the phonograph and be substituted for real persons and dialogue spoken by them in plays upon the stage.

The development of the vitascope has already in part fulfilled this prediction. Some of us who have seen the results of its operation, and have been stirred to wonder and admiration by its life-like reproductions, have already begun to speculate as to still greater possibilities in store for it. The vitascope is an elaborate machine, on a large scale, which, by means of electric power and light, magnifies and throws upon a screen images previously photographed by the kinetoscope apparatus on a long and narrow sensitized gelatine film, like a ribbon. These small negatives on the gelatine ribbon are made at the rate of from forty-six to fifty per second, while the ribbon is running swiftly along, driven by electricity, behind a photographic lens in the kinetoscope. The lens has a shutter, which opens just long enough to admit one impression of the moving object; then closes, while the ribbon passes on for the space of perhaps a quarter of an inch, and opens again to receive another impression.

Every one of the impressions thus received becomes a perfect and sharply outlined photographic negative, stamped on the ribbon in a small fraction of a second, allowing for the pauses when the automatic shutter is closed and no impression at all is being recorded. In one minute about 3,000 of these negatives are made.

In the kinetoscope this ribbon afterward, for the purpose of bringing together in the spectator's eye the blended images of all the negatives, and so creating for him the total impression of a moving form, is revolved behind a lens at a little higher speed than when the photographs were taken upon it. A small electric light placed under or behind it gives illumination to the figures or other objects on the ribbon, and so makes them visible to the spectator.

The vitascope, a far more complicated and powerful structure, takes this same ribbon which has been prepared by the kinetoscope, and coils it up on a disc at the top of the machine, from which it is passed over a system

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of wheels and through a narrow, upright clamp-like contrivance that brings it down to a strong magnifying lens, behind which there is an electric burner of high capacity. The light from this carbon burner blazes fiercely through the translucent ribbon, and projects the images on the negatives there, blended, to a distant screen, with great clearness, for the benefit of the audience. The clamp device just mentioned regulates the gliding or the pausing of the gelatine ribbon, and is further assisted by an automatic hammer below it, which recedes and advances fifty times in a second, keeping the ribbon flat and straight as it passes down before the magnifying lens.

In fifty feet of the photographic gelatine film or ribbon there are some 750 negatives. It takes about forty seconds to run fifty feet of this ribbon through the machine and by the magnifiying lens. Photographic ribbons are now made for the vitascope which are 1,000 feet in length and contain the pictures of three different subjects. In this way, one subject may be shown on the screen, and, after a very slight pause during which the light is intercepted by an automatic swinging shutter, the next subject can be exhibited without stopping to adjust a new gelatine ribbon.

The cinematograph, contrived by Lumière, of Paris, which has also been displayed recently in New York, gives much the same results as the Edison vitascope; but, if I am rightly informed, it is worked on the kinetoscope plan. The pictures are thrown out through a shutter lens, and the continuity of impression is liable to be somewhat broken.

The point that interests us most at present, however, is whether the vitascope can be utilized to replace, in the future, the ordinary stage scenery to which we have now—through many generations of experience and much artistic work—become accustomed. No serious attempt has so far, I believe, been made to use the phonograph in direct coöperation with vitascopes. This may be partly for the reason that no entirely satisfactory transmitter has yet been made for sending out the recorded phonograph speech in a large auditorium. Yet it seems almost inevitable that, in time, a successful combination of the two instruments will be made, so that a play may be given with the actors, the voices, and surroundings created wholly by mechanical means and run by electric motor, supervised by two or three trained assistants. That would be an exhibition copying the drama enacted by living beings, and although somewhat apart from it, yet very useful, no doubt, in private houses, or in places where a theatre and company of actors were lacking. Already, in the vitascope and cinematograph exhibitions, we notice that where breakers are represented, dashing on the seashore, or a charge of cavalry afield, the illusion is heightened by an accompaniment of appropriate rushing and tramping noises behind the scene, or martial music from the orchestra.

But can the vitascope be so used as to make painted scenery unnecessary in plays performed by flesh and blood actors; or is it likely, at any rate, to replace that to some extent and to become a valuable adjunct in certain particulars of scenic effect upon the stage? It may not for a long time hence be adequate for producing all the illusion needed in placing a scene upon the stage; and as its chief attractiveness is in its representing *motion*, it alone would hardly be called upon to supply the various parts of a stage-setting that are without motion. There seems to be little doubt, however, that the vitascope may soon take an important position in heightening theatrical verisimilitude.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Where, for instance, it is desired to show a waterfall in the background, or a sea-shore with waves rolling in on the beach, or a storm at sea, there can be no question that the vitascope would represent these things, taken absolutely from life, with a thousand-fold more effectiveness and pleasure to the audience than anything in the line of most skilful stage device with which we are now acquainted. Marine views, with sailing vessels, steam yachts, and boats in motion—the dimpling and rippling of the water—and people embarking or disembarking, could be rendered with delicious and genuine vividness. Flags fluttering in the wind; canvas awnings shaking over house-windows; passing clouds, mist, and sunshine in the sky, and puffs of dust in the air could all be conveyed to us without a flaw. A crowd in a background of street; a busy scene in the markets; the coming and going of vehicles—all these could be shown to perfection. It is easy to see, further, that spectacular effects of distant multitudes, of armies advancing, battling, and retreating could be placed before us as nothing else can place them now. Sir Henry Irving achieves a great stage point with his masqueraders trooping through the scene, in his production of "The Merchant of Venice." Imagine how much more brilliant and veracious the effect might be with vitascope figures for auxiliaries!

Then, too, in any out-door scene—in "As You Like It," for example, or "King Lear" or "Macbeth"—would it not be a great enhancement to have the tree-boughs waving, and sunlight and shadow flickering precisely as in nature?

In the matter of panoramic scenery, furthermore, where it is desired to give the impression that the actors are passing through a long stretch of landscape, either on foot or in boats, the vitascope offers facilities which the next generation will probably enjoy to the full.

Certain practical difficulties will present themselves to the inquiring mind, in considering this subject.

If illuminated vitascope backgrounds are to be used on the stage, how shall we make the actors and their surroundings harmonize? At present, the vitascope picture is thrown from the front of the theatre on to the screen which takes the place of the ordinary "flat" of painted canvas at the back of the stage. If this method were continued the actors would necessarily cast grotesque and disconcerting shadows on the vitascope scenery behind them, up the stage. This difficulty can be obviated by placing the vitascope *behind* the screen on the stage; so that there would be no possibility of its radiance causing shadows from the figures of the living actors in front of the screen. Thin, white, transparent muslin should be used for the screen. The only serious obstacle to using the vitascope reproductions in this way from the rear is the fact that on the stages of some theatres there is not room enough behind the scene for the proper working and effect of this machine.

Another important consideration is that of securing proper colors in vitascope scenery. Entirely satisfactory color effects are now secured in the brilliant reproductions, given at a well-known theatre in New York, of skirt and serpentine dances; but this is accomplished only through the careful hand-painting of every separate negative in the series of thousands that are whirled past the magnifying lens. The process, as may easily be conceived, is laborious and costly; and the colors must then be fixed upon all the tiny negatives of the gelatine ribbon with powerful chemicals, in order to prevent their fading under the intense heat of the carbon burner, to which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they are exposed. It does not seem impossible that, for the obtaining of simpler color effects than these, cheaper devices which yet would be adequate may be contrived.

Mr. Edison is now occupied with a much larger form of vitascope—or, as he prefers to call it, kinetoscope—which will make negatives containing as many as *six hundred* moving human figures or other figures in motion; so that immense spectacles may be displayed by it, filling the whole space of the "flat" scene of a theatre. An entire pantomime may thus be reproduced, or a yacht race, a sham battle, a parade, or a horse race with a large part of the onlookers in the grand-stand.

As yet, vitascope exhibitions are confined to episodes lasting from two to five minutes; though, of course, these can be lengthened by running the same or duplicate photographic series past the lens several times in succession. For a waterfall effect or that of a river scene or a wind-stirred forest, this plan of repetition could be advantageously used. Moreover, a thousand-foot ribbon will run for about thirteen minutes; and if this were all devoted to one subject, no repetition would be necessary. Thirteen minutes, in a play, is a long stretch of time.

It may be added here that the cost of actually operating the vitascope is very small. With regard to possible panoramic effects on the stage, also, it is interesting to observe that some of Mr. Edison's assistants, under his direction, have lately made experiments in taking kinetoscopic negatives for use in the vitascope, with a kinetoscope mounted on a revolving platform, so that while the instrument itself remains in the one spot it takes in a large sweep of scenery, which is afterwards brought before us in the vitascope as though it were a landscape that we were viewing while we moved by. I believe that it is intended also to prepare negative ribbons with instruments placed on railroad trains or boats to take in continuous views of the scenery visible from these.

One practical difficulty has been met with, which cannot at present be overcome in all cases, viz., the jarring of the cabinet in which the kinetoscopic recording camera is set. The construction and action of the machine are so fine and so sensitive that slight vibrations interfere with the running of the gelatine ribbon on a line equally true at each movement. This, I understand, is the cause of that slight oscillation or upward and downward jolting of the picture when it comes before us on the screen. The cabinet has to be carried around and set down in all sorts of places; not always with a steady foundation available. In some cases, where conditions have been favorable, the reproduced blended picture is perfectly steady; in others it joggles, as though shaken in its frame. Frequently, too, small flecks or points of sharp white light appear in the picture, with a slightly dazzling effect. These are due to flying motes or particles in the air, which become fixed on the film or ribbon during the process of coating it. No remedy for this minor defect has yet been found. But it is not unreasonable to suppose that, after further effort, all the small drawbacks of the present will be overcome.

Mr. D. Macfarlan Moore, whose display of the vacuum tube electric light in New York, last winter, drew great attention from scientific men and admiration from the public, looks upon the projection of pictures for stage scenery as entirely practicable. The vacuum tube, he says, fitted to give light of almost any tint, would be an ideal means of stage illumination or decoration. But one of the most marvellous applications of vacuum tubes

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to stage effects, he thinks, will be by the use of induction. Actors may be provided with light glass wands of any conceivable shape, which, by varying the vacuum can be made to radiate light of any desired color; neither the wands nor the actors being connected to anything electrical, since the induction screen influencing the wands or tubes would be placed above the stage and out of sight. Here is another possible solution of the color problem in the "projected" scenery of the theatre of the future.

GEORGE PARSONS LATHROP.

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE OPIUM WAR.

THE article by Mr. David A. Wells which appeared in the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for June has for its expressed object to repel an unjust charge commonly brought against the policy of England by American writers. It may seem ungracious on the part of an Englishman to repudiate the plea which he makes in respect of the opium war; but that portion of his article is, in effect, an attack upon the position taken up by those British citizens who have, during the past half century, spent time and money in seeking to reverse the policy of their own government with regard to the opium traffic—not without many encouragements, and some notable victories. As one of those thus assailed, I trust that I may be allowed to controvert some of the statements contained in the article, which is very far indeed from being, as the writer claims, "a summary of the indisputable facts."

The "complete evidence" which Mr. Wells states to have only recently become popularly accessible to refute the charge against the British government of forcing opium upon China, is manifestly that contained in the appendices to the Report of the Royal Commission on Opium, presented to our Parliament last year. These papers, however, disclosed no new facts of any importance with regard to the opium war: they do but summarize the despatches presented to Parliament at the time, and already used by all competent historians, such as the American Dr. Wells Williams, in his *Middle Kingdom*, and Justin McCarthy, in his *History of Our Own Times*. They have also been fully referred to by the authors of the two prize essays which have become standard monographs on the opium question, the Rev. Storrs Turner, in his *British Opium Policy*, and Mr. J. Spencer Hill, in *The Indo-Chinese Opium Trade*.

To say that the opium war was instituted "in order to force" China to take opium may perhaps be taken to imply that such was the express intention of the statesmen responsible for it, and is therefore a mode of statement which is better avoided. But it is a good old rule of the common law that a man is taken to intend the consequences which he must have known were likely to result, and which have in fact resulted, from his action. For such consequences he is criminally responsible, and the law does not stop to enquire into his motives. Just in this way the government of Lord Melbourne, and the British Parliament, which, by a narrow majority, approved its proceedings, must be held guilty of having forced opium upon China.

The statement that "previous to the inception of the so-called opium war between England and China (*i. e.*, in 1840) opium was cultivated in no less than ten of the provinces of China," contains an important error of date. It is manifestly taken from a paper laid before the Opium Commission by the late Sir Thomas Wade, formerly British Minister in China, and stated by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

him to have been compiled from information furnished by a respectable young Chinese merchant at Canton. But the date of that paper is 1847, and it contains the following statement with regard to one of these provinces: "The crop in Kwang Tung was said to be in 1847 from 8,000 to 10,000 piculs, so vastly has the quantity produced increased *since Commissioner Lin's proceedings in* 1839," the proceedings which led to the war. Sir Thomas Wade, in his evidence, quoted from the Chinese state papers on the opium question shortly before the war a declaration made by the censors that the poppy "was then grown in four or five provinces." It is plain that this was regarded as a new development of the evil, arising out of the taste that had been created by imported opium; for the opium crave, when once formed, is well known to be the most imperious of all appetites. The result of the war of 1840 was to defeat the honest and determined attempt of the imperial government of China to stamp out the traffic, and this naturally led to an increase in the home growth of the poppy.

After our second war with China, which induced the Chinese government reluctantly to submit to the legalization of the traffic by placing opium in the tariff of imports, there was a further and yet more rapid increase. According to the testimony of missionaries who have lived long in China, the growth of the poppy has enormously developed since they first went to that country, and consular reports are to the same effect. The Rev. Dr. Griffith John, who has been laboring in China more than forty years, in a letter I received from him a few years ago, writes: "We (the British people) are responsible, not only for supplying the Chinese with an enormous quantity of poison from India, but also for setting agoing its wide-spread cultivation in China. . . . The opium war gave an impulse to the cultivation, and, since the legalization of the traffic, the poppy, like a noxious weed, has been running over the whole land."

Mr. Wells is altogether in error when he says that before the war of 1840 the importation of opium "was permitted and regularly taxed the same as any other imports." The trade had been prohibited in China for more than a century before the war.* That there was much corruption among the mandarins, and that they had established a tariff of hush money, is notorious; if this is all that Mr. Wells means, he has certainly used very misleading terminology. There was no analogy between this contraband trade and the lawful commerce carried on at Canton in other goods, under regulations sanctioned by the Chinese government. So far from opium being "imported into China by the East India Company . . . without any inhibition," the company had long found it necessary, in order to preserve their liberty of trading in China, rigorously to exclude opium from their own ships: and the trade was carried on by outside merchants, whom they licensed, and to whom they sold the drug at Calcutta, but for whose dealings they nevertheless told the Chinese authorities they had no responsibility.

It is quite true that, on the question of intercourse, China made preposterous claims to treat all foreign powers as inferiors. But nothing is more clear than the fact that it was not these claims, but the seizure of contraband opium, which was the direct cause of the war. This was expressly stated to have been the case by Sir Henry Pottinger, the British plenipotentiary who negotiated, in 1842, the Treaty of Nanking.

* See Dr. Edkins' *Historical Sketch*, reprinted in the First Report of the Royal Commission, p. 156, par. 27.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

With regard to the attempt to execute a Chinaman in front of the foreign factories, which Mr. Wells assumes to have been "for the purpose of deliberate insult to foreigners," he has omitted to mention that the man had been convicted of selling opium. The object of the Chinese authorities obviously was to impress upon the foreign merchants their determination no longer to permit their salutary laws against opium smuggling to be set at defiance, even by their own subjects. But every warning was lost upon the traders, and the Chinese were thus at length led to take the strong measures which brought on the war.

Impartial and unprejudiced readers of the contemporary despatches will agree with the judgment pronounced at the time by Dr. Arnold, of Rugby, that the opium war was "a national sin of the greatest possible magnitude." Mr. Gladstone's speech in the House of Commons, made during the debate on the war, has been ratified as the judgment of history, and may well be set off against the opinion of Mr. Quincy Adams, as quoted by Mr. Wells:

"A war more unjust in its origin, a war more calculated to cover this country with permanent disgrace, I do not know, and I have not read of. The right honorable gentlemen opposite spoke of the British flag waving in glory at Canton. That flag is hoisted to protect an infamous contraband traffic; and if it were never hoisted except as it is now hoisted on the coast of China, we should recoil from its sight with horror. Although the Chinese were undoubtedly guilty of much absurd phraseology, of no little ostentatious pride, and of some excess, justice, in my opinion, is with them; and whilst they, the pagans, the semi-civilized barbarians, have it on their side, we, the enlightened Christians, are pursuing objects at variance both with justice and with religion."

The United States have freed themselves from all complicity with the opium traffic by their treaty with China, which absolutely forbids American citizens to import opium into that country. Those who, in the United Kingdom, are striving to induce their native land to follow this good example, and thus do all that can now be done to wipe out the crime of the past, whilst getting rid of the national disgrace that attends her continued participation in the evil traffic, may surely count upon the sympathy and support of all right-minded citizens of the American Republic.

JOSEPH G. ALEXANDER,
Hon. Sec. Society for the Suppression of the Opium Trade.

ROMAN AND ANGLO-SAXON CRIMINAL JURISPRUDENCE.

The following correspondence refers to a point touched upon by the Mexican Minister in his article on "Criminal Jurisprudence, Roman and Anglo-Saxon," in the July number of the REVIEW.

I.

SENOR DON MATIAS ROMERO,
Minister of the Republic of Mexico, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have read with deep interest your valuable article in the July number of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, contrasting the systems of criminal jurisprudence in force in your own country and in this: and I am happy to say that I have gained from it much information which I had not before possessed, and of which very, very few of our American lawyers, and publicists even, have any adequate knowledge, and I desire, therefore, to sincerely thank you.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

May I, however, take the liberty of correcting a misstatement contained in the paragraph commencing at the bottom of page 88. It would seem that you regard the power of a court of equity to restrain the enforcement of a common-law judgment as equivalent to the power of a court of appeal. As a matter of fact, it is not so. A court of equity has no power whatever, under our system of jurisprudence, to interfere where an appeal would be the proper remedy. But where there has been fraud, or where it appears that judgment has been entered when, in fact, no summons has been served on defendant, although the record recites that summons has been served, a court of equity may act, provided the question could not have been raised in the common-law suit, by reason of want of knowledge on the part of the defendant until after the expiration of the term of court, or some similar reason. In addition, the defendant who seeks the aid of a court of equity in such case must show that the plaintiff had no cause of action; but, if an appeal can be taken, an appeal must be taken, or defendant cannot complain.

The error into which you have inadvertently fallen is, perhaps, a natural one, and does not detract in the least from the value of your article, for which I again express my appreciation.

I am, respectfully, your obedient servant.

EDWIN I. FELSENTHAL.

II.

MR. EDWIN I. FELSENTHAL,

DEAR SIR: In answer to your kind and appreciative note concerning my article in the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, contrasting the criminal systems of the Roman and the English law, I have to say that I am entirely aware that under the English or Anglo-American system of jurisprudence, there is technically no appeal from the courts of common law to the courts of equity, but that the concurrent jurisdiction of courts of common law and equity and the power of courts of equity in many cases to annul or restrain the judgments of courts of law had the practical effect of an appeal from the latter to the former. Probably I did not use the term "appeal" in the strict technical sense which it has in your jurisprudence, but rather in the common sense. However, your great commentator, Sir Edward Coke, in his famous controversy with Lord Bacon concerning the jurisdiction of equity, would seem to have regarded the exercise of the jurisdiction assumed by equity as an attempt to give an appeal to the courts of chancery from the courts of common law.

Thanking you for the kind expressions concerning my article contained in your letter. I am, very truly yours,

M. ROMERO.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED